

C. S. Love

THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM,
A
Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly.

REV. M. B. DeWITT, EDITOR.

—•••—
IN MEDIO TUTISSIMUS IBER.
—•••—

C. S. Love
Old Series, Vol. IX.——New Series, Vol. IV.

NO. XL—APRIL, 1873.

NASHVILLE, TENN.
CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION,
41 UNION STREET.
1873.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Motion. By Prof. A. H. BUCHANAN, Lebanon, Tenn.....	129
II. The Importance of our Colleges to the Church (<i>concluded</i>). By Rev. B. W. McDONNOLD, D.D., LL.D., Lebanon, Tenn.	139
III. A Practical Exposition of Zechariah vi. 12, 13. By Rev. HENRY MELVILLE, Uniontown, Pa	156
IV. On the Mode of Baptism. By T. B. WILSON, D.D., Marshall, Texas	167
V. The Preparation of Sermons for the Pulpit By Rev. W. M. SMITH, Bristow, Ky	181
VI. Creation. By Rev. A. TEMPLETON, Murfreesboro, Tenn...	187
VII. Christian Philosophy. By Rev. T. S. LOVE, Irondale, Mo. 199	
VIII. The Function of Prayer in the Economy of the Universe. <i>Contemporary Review</i>	206
IX. The Scriptural Doctrine of the Triumph of Christ's King- dom Distinguished from Millenarianism. <i>Bibliotheca</i> <i>Sacra</i>	226
Book Notices.....	243

THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

APRIL, 1873.

ART. I.—*Motion.*

EVERY material substance possesses active power, with the capacity of being acted upon, and at the same time cannot act upon itself, or, as the mathematician would say, it is *inert*. These conditions exist for the purpose of causing, receiving, and preserving motion. Though incapable of acting upon itself, it can receive and retain mechanical energy of any intensity and direction, but cannot transform this energy; and its inertia results from these facts. The active principle, which is a property of material substance, enables it to impress motion upon other substances; and without this it could make no impression upon our senses, and we could know nothing of it.

Motion, the result of this action, constitutes one of the three principal mathematical sciences; and *mechanics*, in the enlarged sense, is the *science of motion*. Motion is an essential element in all physical phenomena, and its introduction into the universe of matter was necessarily the preliminary act after its creation. "The earth must have remained forever without form and void, and eternal darkness must have been upon the face of the deep, if the Spirit of God had not first moved upon the face of the waters." The forces of matter, as well as matter itself, must therefore be regarded as having

a *spiritual origin*. Motion has been their usual form of mechanical exhibition since they were first imparted to the physical world, and is the simplest manifestation of power; while our first idea of force comes from the conscious effort required to produce it.

By some the forces of matter are styled the *direct power of God*, exerted through it; but we could with equal propriety call any other property of matter an attribute of Deity, and might at once style matter itself God, and its properties his attributes, and thus measure the power of the Infinite in pounds, and circumscribe his immensity by the material universe. A sprinkle of pantheistic doctrine, in our day, seems to be a kind of recommendation, and to entitle one to renown. Is it not a higher order of Deity that not only creates matter, but also, "*in the beginning*," impresses upon it an active principle that attracts or repels all other matter, and produces "the endless variety of form and beauty which the universe of nature has been working out ever since? Why should it be inconsistent with the spiritual origin of the forces of matter that they reside in centers of action, which are not thinking beings, but particles of matter? The capacity of matter to receive energy from other matter, or from mind, that exhibits itself in the form of motion, and the capacity to communicate it to other matter, under fixed laws, "is not less difficult to explain nor more conceivable, than the capacity to receive and contain it in this more refined and latent form, from which it may manifest itself under equally fixed laws."

It is only when force is physical and not mental that it can be subject to precise laws, and admit of certain calculation; and to motion arising from this kind of force our subject is limited. The power of the human mind over matter and its laws is of a higher order, and that of the infinite Mind infinitely higher still, and as yet beyond comprehension, to say nothing of computation. The actual force of the will which must be originated to give rise to the greatest possible animal power, though impotent to move a grain of sand of itself, may be no greater than is necessary to move an atom—no more, in comparison with the physical force developed, than that put forth in touching the key which, by completing the elec-

trical circuit, explodes the mine and submerges a nation's fleet. Though the attempt to illustrate the superiority of the infinite Mind would be absurd, may not man, through the fact that his power of will is thus limited by the want of outward means, a consequence of his connection with matter, climb to the great thought, unaided by revelation, that the great First Cause, possessing infinite resources, creates, upholds, and governs all?

Let us not go to another extreme with thousands of presumptuous men, to suppose it within our power, great as it may be, to originate what is technically styled *perpetual motion*. By reason of the ever-attendant resistances to mechanical motion, this must be defined to be that of a system or machine which would constantly return to the same position, with an increase of power above that impressed upon it, at least sufficient to overcome these unavoidable resistances attendant upon each revolution. A constitution of the class of forces that depend solely upon the relative positions of the bodies or parts of a machine in which they are made to reside, and from which all outside resistances are excluded, would make this kind of motion possible. Such a constitution may not be incompatible with the unbounded power of the Creator; but had it been introduced into nature, it would have prevented human belief in a great First Cause superior to matter, and the necessity of one, and would have subjected, to some extent, the great plan of divine benevolence to the will and caprice of man.

Writers often seem to make no distinction between force and motion, while their relation is that of cause and effect. Prof. Rankine substitutes the word energy for force. Are not these all really separate and distinct, because they never have a common measure? The rate of motion varies as the square root of the force or energy originating it. Four times the quantity of fuel (energy) is necessary to double the velocity of the locomotive engine; and if one pound of gunpowder (energy) gives a certain velocity, four pounds are required to double that velocity, under the same circumstances. For another distinction, it is only necessary to consider the fact that we are surrounded by a vast array of statical energies resist-

ing the most energetic solicitations of force to motion. A sense of the expenditure of energy is experienced in attempting to hold aloft a heavy weight motionless. A bridge, with its own weight and that of its load, is an example of energy in repose, to be developed ultimately, it may be, in its own destruction and that of human life.

One of our own scientific men seems to speak of physical motion as a new creation under whatever form it appears, and capable again of complete annihilation. This is based on the assumption that the production of motion is a creation, and its extinction an annihilation. Should it not rather be said that motion disappears by transformation into energy that manifests itself again in another form? Motion is a contingency, and therefore not created. The same reasoning applies to annihilation.

Motion must exist in and be of something, and that something is matter. Matter embraces every thing that moves or is capable of motion, and is the vehicle of energy. "We have three kinds of motion—mass motion, molecular motion, and atomic motion." All physical forces that can produce motion—all powers of matter—must be either attractive or repulsive. "Of attraction there are three kinds—that between masses, called gravitation; that which binds molecules together, called cohesion, when these are alike, adhesion when unlike; and that which takes place between atoms, called chemism, the latter within its own limits being irresistible." Gravitation, among all the forces of nature, is conspicuous for its universality and the grandeur of the scale upon which it is exhibited. It aids in the production of the various forms of motion termed uniform, varied, retarded, accelerated, rectilinear, curvilinear, etc., which it is not necessary to explain here. We have from it motion of rotation, of translation, and of the two combined. It acts upon all matter, and the law of its intensity is, that it varies inversely as the square of the distance between the bodies, and is directly proportional to the quantity of matter. Motion, in thousands of varieties, takes place around us daily from the action of this force. By it a stone falls to the ground, and is warmed by the shock; meteors plunge into our atmosphere, and become incandes-

cent. In the heavens it is displayed on the grandest scale. We hear and read so often of Kepler's laws and Newton's theory of gravitation, by which these motions are explained, that we forget the great importance attaching to their discovery. These laws are not strictly true, and were not demonstrated by their discoverer, but found by what is called "the method of trial and error;" yet what in nature has aided more than they, with Newton's law of gravitation, to give us exalted views of Deity? The fact that this force (so nicely adjusted to the force of projection, as it is called, and of which we talk so learnedly, and yet know nothing) holds in its place and keeps forever whirling in its respective orbit each planet of our system in perfect harmony with all the rest, and our system, with the countless myriads of others similar to it belonging to our universe, whirling in its proper path about some unknown center; the fact that it keeps our universe, with other universes, which some of the nebulae are supposed to be, moving with reference probably to some still higher and grander center, surely gives the most sublime idea that nature can afford of "Him who made the worlds and upholds all things by the word of his power."

If we pass from the motion of the spheres to that of molecules and atoms, we shall find phenomena at least as wonderful, if not as sublime. It is the opinion of scientists that in all solids the atoms which make the molecule, however firmly locked by chemism in their fixed relations of distance and position, are yet capable of revolution in their magic spheres, without affecting solidity. The molecules also, as such, have motions of their own, which may be due to that of their constituent atoms. Every chemical action produces a physical result evolving heat, light, or electricity. Heat is an effect due to the motion of material particles, and hence inseparable from matter. Light has been shown to be identical in its nature with heat, the difference being only in intensity and wave-length. Electricity, like heat, is generally regarded to be the effect of a mode of motion. Some regard it as a force like gravitation, with which it is equally universal and subject to the same law in respect to distance. But light and heat are also subject to this law, and electricity, like them,

differs from gravity in that its effect is not instantaneous, which fact seems to prove it the effect of a mode of motion. If then heat, light, and possibly electricity, are not forces, but effects due to certain modes of motion, and matter is the vehicle of motion, all space must be filled with matter in some form. The best possible reasons, then, support the conclusion that celestial spaces are occupied by this matter in an almost infinitely attenuated form called ether. Whatever its nature may be, its existence is no longer a hypothesis, but a fact, of which most scientific men are as fully convinced as they are of the existence of the sun. Light, heat, and possibly electricity, are simply the effects of vibrations produced in this ethereal medium by other matter.

Mr. Tyndall says: "Were the matter of the universe cast in cold detached fragments into space, and there abandoned to the mutual gravitation of its own parts, the collision of the fragments would in the end produce the fires of the stars." Matter was doubtless in that condition when "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," and, as above stated, the result was the forces of nature, and while at the command of Jehovah, "Let there be light," the "shadow-casting" matter was gathered into stars, under the action of these forces, whose intense molecular vibrations, through the ethereal medium thus cleared up, are felt in all parts of His universe in the form of light and heat. Gravity, then, may be the origin of all light and heat. The molecules of a hot body swing with inconceivable rapidity, and this motion is taken up by the ether and transmitted to us as light and heat, just as the air takes up a part of the motion of larger moving bodies. This motion reveals to us that while molecules of matter are held together by one force, they are kept asunder by another, their position at any moment depending upon the equilibrium of attraction and repulsion. Therefore, had we an example of an incompressible substance, wholly devoid of elasticity, that is, possessing no molecular repulsion, but endowed only with cohesion and attraction of gravitation, the theory of conservation of energy would not be true. Let two such bodies strike and there could be no rebound, no internal molecular vibration and no heat; their energy would be entirely de-

stroyed. But there are no such bodies, and this doctrine depends upon the coëxistence of these two opposing forces.

The doctrine of "*conservation of energy*" means, then, that one kind of energy is convertible into another, and assumes that it is just as impossible to create or destroy energy as matter. Let us observe how clearly the scientist has demonstrated this in his earnest toil for truth. Chemical attraction of atoms makes gunpowder so powerful; attraction of gravitation gives energy to a raised weight. Remove impediments, the latent becomes active, attraction is converted into motion. The energy of gunpowder, or of a raised weight, is potential—capable of acting; that of exploded gunpowder, or a falling weight, is actual energy resulting in motion. A spark of fire to the one, and cutting the string which sustains the other, converts potential into actual energy. Experiments conclusively prove that when any one of these energies is apparently destroyed, it reappears in another form; when motion is arrested, heat, light, or electricity is developed: the apparent destruction is only transformation. If the moving body be perfectly elastic, its motion is not destroyed when it strikes, but only changed in direction; if non-elastic, it does not rebound, yet its motion is converted into heat, as is shown by an increase of temperature. The friction of hard rubber with the fur of a cat electrifies it, and mechanical motion is reproduced in the electrical spark and shock. In the steam-engine, the steam which leaves the cylinder is cooler than that which enters it by exactly the amount of work done; the motion of the piston is equal to that lost by the molecules of steam. Heat is also converted into electricity when two metals in contact are heated; and by multiplying the number of pairs, the heat of a common lamp may be made to move a small electric engine. Increase the rapidity with which the molecules move to produce heat, and light appears. Interrupt the electrical current by a poorly conducting platinum wire, and it becomes hot by the converted electricity; intensify this action, and the brightest artificial light results for the same reason. The conversion of any one of these energies into another is not complete except in the case of that of mechanical motion into heat. One experimenter found that a body weighing one

pound, falling through seven hundred and seventy-two feet, was exactly equal to the molecular motion which must be added to a pound of water in order to heat it one degree Fahrenheit; and this is called a unit of heat. The chemical force in one pound of coal equals fourteen thousand heat units; and the sun performed this amount of work in the vegetable growth necessary to its production. But when motion is converted into electricity, a part of it appears as heat, a part as light, and a part may expend itself in sound. Heat cannot be entirely converted into any one particular kind of motion. The best steam-engines economize only one-twentieth part of the heat of the fuel.

If we consider attractions, we find the same great law equally true. As all energy not active in motion is potential in attraction, we have energy stored up for subsequent use by means of the attractions. The sun stores up energy every minute in raising two billion tons of water to the mean height of the clouds, three and one-half miles; and the actual energy set free when this water falls is two and three-fourths trillion horse-powers. In the laboratory of the leaf, by the actual energy of its light and heat, carbon is separated from oxygen and plants grow, and thus has been stored up an incalculable amount of energy in the form of coal; and the sun is still storing it up in our vast forests, to be given out again in the form of heat. When, again, by means of the actual energy of the heat derived from the potential energy of the coal and wood, the oxygen and the zinc of the ore are separated in the furnace, this actual energy of heat becomes the potential energy of chemical attraction, which again becomes actual in the form of electricity, when the zinc is dissolved in an acid; and thus the transformation goes on from one form to another indefinitely, without being lost or destroyed. Animal energy even is at last the chemical work of the carbon of our food and the oxygen of the air we inhale, uniting in obedience to their mutual attractions; and their motion toward each other, properly turned to account by the wonderful mechanism of the body, is converted into muscular motion. As in inorganic matter, so in plants and animals, there is no creation of force or motion; and whether the carbon and oxygen of plants re-

combine in the furnace of the steam-engine or the body of an animal, the origin of the resulting energy is the same. Motion is produced whenever potential is transformed into actual energy; and wherever actual is converted into potential energy, there motion is to that extent stored up in this new form. We produce heat when we kindle a fire, pass an electrical current through an imperfect conductor, or simply rub two sticks together; the same result from entirely different operations. We consume heat when we employ steam-power for forging or rolling iron, sawing lumber, or grinding grain, and we measure the amount of heat appropriated by the work performed.

By the one hundred and forty-two degrees of heat, for convenience called latent, necessary to liquify melting ice, without any increase of temperature, it is simply meant that this amount of motion is consumed in overcoming great molecular resistances, and that it has spent itself in forcing the particles of water to a greater distance; while the same amount called free heat given out in freezing again, is due to the diminution of molecular motion in the new state. The heat was no more latent than that developed by igniting the coal in our grates, or that consumed by the engine in raising the cap-stone of a tower to its position, which in turn a century hence, by toppling from its place, shall give back the same amount in work of another form.

Does not the scientific man, then, in his patient, persevering, and earnest search for truth, prove, beyond the possibility of contradiction, that since the Creating Spirit first spoke into existence matter and force, *nothing has been added, nothing lost?* And who would dare call such results "learned nonsense," without having first traveled the same rugged road with him? "Ah! but your scientist is sometimes not a Christian." To his shame this is occasionally true, yet he is honest in his search for the truths of nature, and usually none would quicker renounce error of any kind than he when convinced of it; but truth, from whatever source it comes, is godlike in its character; and the honest worker for it, though not a Christian, works for God in spite of himself. Do we shut our senses to the odor and beauty of the rose because it springs from

the dust beneath our feet? Let us treasure truth from every source, and scorn error even though proclaimed from the sacred desk.

After having traced the little impulse, taking the atom of molecules separately, that started in the great "beginning," through endless transformations by which it helped to make the glorious sun, and prepare the earth with its countless variety of beauty and untold riches and blessings for man; after having followed it still on through the great future history of nature in its untiring work of love for its great Master, will not the thinking man remind himself that this great law of nature is just as true a law in the moral world? Will his heart not thrill with joy in contemplating the impulse started by the influence of the same spirit upon his nature, that led him to "give a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple," and that will vibrate from heart to heart while time lasts, and help to gather the white-robed throng in the world of light, where it will forever swell their joy and that of "Him who sits upon the throne"? Aye, and will he not tremble, too, in contemplating the impulse started by that "idle word" which the tempter induced him to utter, as it stealthily works its way to the hearts of millions throughout time, and helps to gather them in that great harvest of death, and drag them down to confine them in that world of despair?

Thus the laws and forms of motion are wisely adapted to develop and instruct the heart as well as the created intellect. Their relations to man and his wants give infinite promise of spiritual enjoyments in their contemplation, and encourage endless development, which, however, shall never approximate the infinite perfection of the great Author of all mind.

And in his researches there is one lesson, which cannot escape the profound observer: "Every portion of the material universe is pervaded by the same laws of mechanical action which are incorporated into the very constitution of the human mind. The solution of the problem of this universal presence of such a spiritual element is obvious and necessary;" as in Revelation so in Nature—"THERE IS ONE GOD, AND SCIENCE IS THE KNOWLEDGE OF HIM."

ART. II.—*The Importance of our Colleges to the Church.*

[Concluded from January Number.]

UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS.—It requires no argument to show that institutions of learning must have sufficient buildings: the error in this country has generally been that too much stress has been laid upon costly structures.

A few years before the war, a college in New York invested, all its funds in a building. The sum was large enough to have endowed two chairs in the institution, besides paying for plain, comfortable quarters. Ten years saw the end of that enterprise.

The immortal Struve, of Russia, once said to the Emperor Nicholas, when consulted about a national observatory, that Russia would not be stupid enough to imitate France, "where the meridian instruments ought to be removed from the colossal edifice constructed under Louis XIV., and placed in modest apartments adjacent to the principal structure"—that is, vast piles of architecture, intended to ornament the city of Paris, were not the buildings needed for daily use and tedious toil by practical astronomers.

Dr. Wayland, so long the bright light of Brown University, has given us a chapter on the folly of extravagant buildings.

The United States Congress, when making its late munificent grant of lands for agricultural colleges, made a special provision therein that no part of the fund thus given to the States should ever be used for buildings.

Now we, at Lebanon, have a little experience about fine buildings. The very ruins of our old college are magnificent. Those silent columns on the old hill; that vast foundation, buried in ashes; that grand old heap of ruins, so eloquent of former glory, have brought tears to many eyes, while thought went wandering over the years of college-life in those once brilliant halls; and our *alumni*, at their meetings, have found their eloquence inspired and their hearts melted by the melancholy wreck that still lingers on the old site.

The policy of one massive building, in which all departments are packed together, has been abandoned by all the universities which have enough of money and of *experience* to command what they really need. Nowhere in Europe do we find those old universities, full of experience and money as they are, resorting to such policy. I have alluded to Struve and his interview with Nicholas. Under the advice of the ripest practical scholars, Alexander I. planted his university upon the heights of Dorpat, *in scattered buildings*. Under the advice of Struve, Nicholas planted even his observatory on the heights of Poulkova, in several buildings.

Cambridge and Oxford are all over the towns from which they take their names. The universities of Germany are in many buildings—in private rooms, even in churches, in college-halls, and in many different kinds of structures. So of the Italian universities. So in the Netherlands. So all over Europe.

Let the wants of our institutions be met; but let us not waste money in mere ornamental architecture.

I remember a spicy little discussion that once sprang up in a congregation near one of our cities. A committee of ladies had been very active in securing money to build a new church. After every resource had been exhausted, and all the money that there was any hope of securing had been obtained, a meeting was held to discuss the building. Various members of the committee urged that it was a part of the original understanding between them and the donors that the church was to have a steeple just like one in the city. The subscription was not sufficient, but the ladies were inexorable. After several meetings, one of the elders made the following statement: "Brethren and sisters, I have inquired into the exact cost of the steeple, and find it will just about exhaust our building fund. Now, no one supposes that we can, for a moment, dispense with the steeple. I move, therefore, that we build the steeple, and let the other part of the church alone."

Now, the misfortune with us is that we cannot even build the columns, capital, architraves, and friezes that our elegant friends desire.

WHY WE LOSE OUR OWN SONS.—Let us glance a moment at what we have to compete with when we propose to educate our sons at a college of our own Church.

Mississippi University has nearly \$1,000,000 to rely upon, besides tuition-fees.

Yale College, which has always been attracting more or less of our young men away from us, has increased her educational facilities, since the war, over \$700,000.

Brown University, of the Baptist Church, has, within a few years, added to all its former wealth, donations worth \$160,000.

Amherst College has, within a few years, added to its endowment \$350,000.

In the same recent period, Bethlehem College has increased its wealth by \$500,000.

The Campbellite College, in Kentucky, has secured nearly \$500,000 *since the war*. In the city of Lexington, alone, this institution secured over \$100,000, and did it in a few months' time.

The Virginia State University has an annual appropriation from the State of \$15,000, besides its receipts from tuition-fees. Local circumstances have, of late years, made this noble institution the special rival of Cumberland University.

Cornell University has property worth \$1,934,000.

Wisconsin University has vested funds worth \$706,773.

The richest, however, of all our colleges, is Harvard. For two hundred years donations, by the ten thousand and the hundred thousand, have been pouring into that institution.

In 1867, LaFayette College, Pennsylvania, raised, in one single day at a college festival, subscriptions amounting to \$100,000.

I find that Washington College, Virginia, has secured, since the war, about as much paid-up donations from members of our Church as has Cumberland University.

I find the Baptists, in the single State of Georgia, have, since the war, gone ahead of our whole Church in donations to their college. I find the same thing true of the Baptists in Virginia. Now, these two States surely had their share of war and its ruins; *but their people are simply in earnest in what they undertake.*

Now, it is utterly impossible for our Church-schools to compete with these and many other such endowed colleges. We have not been doing so; but have, from year to year, lost scores of our noblest young men from our own colleges and from our own Church forever. I have taken some pains to investigate this matter, and I find, by the hundred, noble young men, sons of our own people, sent off to other colleges. It would be a very easy thing to show that enough money has been spent in sending sons of the Church abroad to school, were it all concentrated on one institution, to give that institution a splendid endowment.

I can count half a dozen such cases from the very county in which Cumberland University stands. If the counties where I have made inquiries be taken as an average, the number in the State will reach two hundred.

Two hundred sons of Cumberland Presbyterians gone from Tennessee to the colleges of other Churches! More than the State, all told, sends to this University. From other States, the average can scarcely be less; and yet, if all these were here, it would start us on the high-road to prosperity.

O that our people would learn to respect themselves, make their own schools equal to any, and then patronize their own schools! While we educate four or five hundred of our sons at our own schools, we educate a thousand at the schools of other Churches. At least one-third of these join those other Churches; and half the rest are never ours in good earnest. Thus, the life-blood silently oozes out of our youthful body.

WHY OUR COLLEGES ARE NOT ENDOWED.—A writer in the *Banner of Peace*, signing his name "Fidelis," tells us about an endowment that was lost to our theological school through the influence of a disaffected minister.

That is far from being the only case of the kind. If the reports I hear be true, \$100,000 passed into private hands, not a great while ago, after the will had once been written giving that sum to Cumberland University.

The influence that turned this donation away from us was a communication in the Church-papers.

Another \$100,000 was turned away from the Church, perhaps from Lincoln University, by the influence of similar

newspaper correspondence on an old man in a Northern State. After reading this correspondence, he changed his will, and gave the \$100,000 to the old Presbyterian Church. Soon afterward he died, and the money passed from us forever.

I give these two cases on the authority of tolerably direct testimony. I believe them both to be true.

Now, I heartily indorse a statement made by Dr. Baird, on the floor of our last General Assembly. That is: "We better have *no newspapers*, if they are to be made the channels through which malcontents attack our enterprise."

Only the other day, an article appeared in the papers which was full of injurious *misrepresentations* of the facts about the Murdock professorship.

A few years ago, a Presbytery, here in our own field, passed resolutions denouncing Cumberland University because, under pressure from the Church, it required refunding bonds from the candidates for the ministry. These resolutions were published, both in the papers of the Church and also in pamphlet form; and the publication *preceded* any private remonstrance against the obnoxious requirement.

The articles which do so much mischief are very rarely free from misrepresentation. The writer eats a big supper, rests badly, dreams badly, imagines a great many evil things. "See how the share comes to us."

Sometimes there are private griefs to prompt the attack. Colleges and Church-boards are peculiarly obnoxious to these private griefs. A boy expelled, a degree not given, a mission-station wanted in vain, are fruitful sources of such animosities. While the publication-board only has to refuse a manuscript to learn that it, too, is not exempt from the "wrath of Achilles."

Now, I say that private expostulation with our enterprises ought always to be tried before any public attack is made.

I say, farther, our papers ought to decline the communications of the malcontents. Men in charge of our institutions cannot, and will not, stop their noble work to notice these growlers.

The history of these growlers and their writings, since the first American college began its career to this day, would be

a melancholy history of private griefs and personal spite, generally cloaked with high pretensions of friendship to the institution attacked.

Frequently, the writer is an *alumnus* of the institution, and, of course, behind no one in high regard to its prosperity. He is prompted *only* by a desire to correct evils, etc. He has not, however, remonstrated in private; and he does not tell us, in public, that his merits as a scholar have been overlooked by his *Alma Mater*; or that he has failed to secure the position he sought in the institution. Of course, I admit some exceptions, where men are not prompted by bad motives in these attacks; but, from the pitiful scribblers who worried poor President Hoar, in the beginning of Harvard's life, down to the last dyspeptic who has abused the colleges of our own Church, private griefs have been the *principal* sources of all these attacks.

X HOW SHALL OUR COLLEGES SECURE ENDOWMENT?—Whenever the Church really resolves to have an endowed college, we shall have it. I do not mean paper resolutions; I mean *heart* and *pocket* resolutions.

Let the Presbyteries feel that the college is their own, then congregational and general action will follow. The ministry and eldership will see to this matter. Small contributions from our entire membership can be secured, if the ministry will do their duty. Now, this general action is the first great lever to prize up big donations. Take an example or two. Monongalia county, West Virginia, had a little county academy which it fostered with great and general liberality from the whole county. That signal interest of the county in its academy caused the State to direct its "land grants" all to that academy, thus placing 150,000 acres of land in the control of that little institution. Champaign county, Illinois, voted a tax of \$400,000 to secure the location of a college. The State responded to this action of the people by giving them its agricultural college, with its vast endowment.

It was to Union College, long fostered by the gifts of a multitude of poor people, that Dr. Nott gave \$600,000.

"He that hath to him shall be given" is the law in college-endowment.

Let our people *generally* contribute to aid our colleges, and I will underwrite for some large donations before the next winter. God will help those who help themselves; but if our people generally do not want a college, then the rich are excusable for withholding their gifts.

The next thing necessary to secure large endowment is for our people to show more magnanimity toward our colleges. When the Baptist Church in Georgia thwarted the plans of the only benefactor their college had, and moved it away from the town of his choice, the generous, the magnanimous Mercer not only did not withdraw his donations, but actually increased them considerably.

When the funds of Harvard College were perverted by their treasurer, the generous men who gave these funds did not let go the institution, but rallied with more zeal to its assistance.

When the princely donations of Hollis were perverted from the uses to which he had restricted them, and applied to uses which he had positively forbidden, his noble soul did not let go the college, but increased toward it in noble generosity.

Brethren, we must have more magnanimity if we would ever see our enterprises succeed. What if blunders have been made? They have been made by all the trustees of all the colleges on earth, and yet a magnanimous people have repaired the injury, and made those colleges, many of them, a splendid success. A pitiful fault-finding spirit in the Church, crying out against the Church's own enterprises, will forever bar the door against large donations, and against all outside help. Brethren, other Churches have more policy than this.

Again, if we would secure large endowment, our people, our ministry especially, must work for it. Time was when, for a few months, all our leading ministers worked for our college at Princeton. During those few months, money poured in faster than at any other time in our history.

Go to your men of wealth; talk to them on this subject. You will not find them such hard cases as you suppose. They will look on your pleadings very differently from the pleadings of an agent. The latter they will regard as D'Estaing did the death of a soldier, "He git what he hire for."

The ladies of our Church can help in this way. They can plead our cause with the wealthy, as the noble Hannah More pleaded the cause of Kenyon College, though it was many thousand miles away from her country. Kindred who are in no need of the wealth of their relatives can help also. Take the noble letter of Amos Lawrence to his brother Abbott, in regard to the latter's splendid donation to a literary institution:

"WEDNESDAY, March 9, 1867.

"DEAR BROTHER ABBOTT:—I hardly dare trust myself to speak what I feel, and write a word to say that I thank God I am spared to this day to see accomplished, by one so near and dear to me, this last best work ever done by one of our name, which will prove a better title to nobility than any from the potentates of the old world. It is more honorable and more to be coveted than the highest political station in our country. . . . It is to impress on unborn millions the great truth that our talents are trusts committed to us for use, and to be accounted for when the Master calls. . . . It enriches your descendants in a way that mere money never can do, and is a better investment than any one you have ever made.

"Your affectionate brother,

AMOS."

Now, some of the readers of this article have wealthy relatives who ought to aid our colleges. Will you show some of Amos Lawrence's magnanimity?

Again, let it be borne in mind that we have men, plenty of them, who are abundantly able to make large donations. Let not our people aid the devil in circulating that lie that we are too poor to endow our colleges. Count over, my brother, how much was lost by members of our Church in your county by the war. They bore that loss and yet live. But they pleaded poverty before the war just as much as they do now. Suppose half of what has been lost had been given to the Church: could the donors not have supported their families and lived happily? Look around you and see what members of our Church are paying for railroads—plenty to endow our colleges! Yes, and still the donors live. O it is the will that

is wanting! We must create that interest that will call forth their munificence.

BLESSINGS FOR THE WEALTHY.—It is a great blessing to be rich. When God prospers honest industry, energy, and enterprise, it is a great favor. Many who have all these good qualities have seen calamity, sickness, or war sweep away all the fruits of their toil. What a blessing it is to you, my brother, if you have been made an exception. Many a young man, full of all the resources necessary to success in business, has been called by the Holy Spirit into the army of unpaid ministers. You are free to make money, and God has allowed you to succeed. Does not your heart feel its obligations to God?

What a blessing it is to be able to help the enterprises of the Church that we love! Many, very many, have found it to be the greatest comfort of their lives. What lofty happiness Abbott Lawrence has found in this way! What pleasure glowed in the heart of the noble Hollis all his days, because he was enabled, by his own donations, to relieve the wants of Harvard College in the Far West! What noble emotions must swell in the bosom of Ezra Cornell, as he looks upon that proud university which bears his name, and feels that, down to the latest ages, the fruits of his munificence shall be gathered by American students!

What a noble deed was that of Smithson, when he established, in a nation not his own, that ever-enduring monument to his fame, the Smithsonian Institute!

There is, in our Federal city, an unfinished monument to George Washington. It is a useless pile of marble. But in old Virginia, there is a college, endowed and established by Washington's own donations, that is a far more precious monument to his memory.

The name of the Indian lingers in mountains, but the name of a noble Englishman was infinitely better handed down to unknown nations, when his generosity caused that name to be given to Yale College. Some of you who read this will die childless—no one to hand down your name. O write it with noble munificence upon some of our colleges! King Alfred's name echoes along the centuries through which the

English universities have lived. What a noble memorial of a great life!

Examples of princely liberality there have been in all the Churches of Christendom, save only ours. The liberality of the Ewings was as noble, in proportion to their estates, as any on record in other Churches. Other men of moderate prosperity, and ladies, too, of medium affluence, have given us examples as noble as we could ask. We hope, in a short time, to have for publication some other instances of such munificence from members of our Church. But our men of *large* wealth have given us no examples proportionate to *their* ability.

The Free Church of Scotland is younger than ours, but men in its communion, no richer than some of our members, have given to its enterprises gifts four or five times as large as our Church ever received. The same thing is true of the Campbellite Church in this country. In one single Southern town, the members of that Church, since the war, raised \$100,000 for their Church university.

Have the wealthy men of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church no deep love for their denominational enterprises? There is a wide field open for usefulness, for happiness, for honorable distinction—open to any wealthy man among us who will break the long spell of parsimony, and *lead* our rich men in deeds of munificence. Professorships are waiting to take the names of such men. Colleges, even, are ready to write the name of some such benefactor upon their immortal brows. The endowment of Denison University was raised by voluntary meetings of wealthy men, without agencies.

Donations of \$20,000, \$50,000, \$100,000, are common things in the history of our Northern colleges. Donations of half-million, and even a million of dollars, they have sometimes had. And wealthy men in our part of the country *must* form the habit of munificence to such enterprises. Thomas Jefferson, when he failed to arouse a large generosity to schools in his own State, lifted up the voice of prophecy over Virginia's future: "We shall one day melt away in our forms of civilization before the sons of New England, as the Indian has melted away before the Anglo-Saxon." I quote from memory.

Education is a power too great to be neglected by our Southern planters. Once when I had tried in vain, as agent for Cumberland University, to secure a small donation from an elder in our Church, whose property was worth \$100,000, I told him that I greatly feared the Lord God would punish him sorely for his conduct. "I take that risk," was the reply. To-day, his family are living in poverty—that handsome estate all gone.

I knew another case where a Church-agent expressed similar fears to a wealthy gentleman. That gentleman's only daughter inherited all his wealth. An unprincipled wretch married her for her money, wasted it all, abused and maltreated her, and then left her in destitution.

Ye members of my Church, whom God has prospered, remember that your estates all come from him, and if you turn a deaf ear to the calls of his Church, he will not forget it. "O Solon, Solon," was the exclamation of Cræsus, when he was placed on the pile of fagots to be burned. Solon had told him not to boast of the happiness which wealth brought until he saw the *end*.

Thy wealth, thy treasured pride,
Thy mansion's favored seat,
Washed by the river's yellow tide
Each favorite retreat.

Thou must leave all, all,
And thine heir shall run
In riot through the wealth
Thine years of toil have won.

Blessings for the rich come not by hoarding up money for their children. God's enduring curse rests upon that wealth which has ever been deaf to the calls of his Church.

Dives was lost, not for being rich, but for the selfish use he made of his wealth. Abraham and Job used their wealth so as to bring long-enduring blessings on their families. I can count over, in Middle Tennessee alone, wealthy members of our Church, many of them without children or poor kin, plenty of them to endow this institution, and yet have enough left to live on. Ah, is there no lofty magnanimity in our

State? Shall any little village in all New England be able to put our whole State to the blush, when we come to compare our munificence to colleges with theirs?

I have, since I commenced writing this series, received letters from old friends who tell me that I am following a forlorn hope; that Cumberland Presbyterian rich men never have learned how to give, and never will learn. I repel this as a slander, so far as it predicts the future of our people. True, our gifts have hitherto come mainly from the poor, but I believe a great change is at hand. I believe our successful men will divide their estates with the enterprises which our Saviour's cause has set on foot. Once, our little Church lacked the confidence of financial men; it is not so now. The storm that wrecked other vessels saw ours ride safely into port. Even wealthy aristocrats, that almost blushed once to own that they belonged to our Church, now feel very comfortable in our communion. Come up, ye that have money, and place our enterprises on a safe footing, and you shall never more hear of those "low flings" at our denomination from other Churches. That book-maker that put Daniel Boone's picture for our representative will change his tactics. That poor brother who said that the difference between Presbyterian and Cumberland Presbyterian was the difference between turkey and turkey-buzzard will sing another song.

I love my noble Church. Her present attitude is a proud one, and with God's blessings, this university shall yet stand at the very head of all Southern institutions.

A TALK WITH ALL TRUE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIANS.—I hear it said on all sides that there is a new style of religion, a new style of Cumberland Presbyterianism, coming into use. It is not for that element that I write to-day; but if there be any reader of these articles who loves our practical doctrines, who loves the memory of our great revivals, who cherishes the memory of those spiritual ministers that planted our Church amidst the cabins of the frontier, to him I make my appeal.

Would you, my brother, see the strength of your Church drift away to strangers? If not, we must educate our own sons. Would you, my brother, see foreign elements brought

into our communion, strange fire placed on our altars, strange practices, tastes, and doctrines taking the place of original Cumberland Presbyterianism? If not, our ministry, our eldership, our Sunday-school officers, our college professors, our common-school teachers, all must be trained up in our own colleges.

History, for all past time, is full of lessons on this subject. The pure spirituality of the Waldensian Church was put in jeopardy by sending the sons of the Church abroad to be educated. Prayer-books were brought by these sons from their foreign colleges, and introduced into the Waldensian congregations; and, but for the alarm which these congregations took—an alarm which drove them to establish a college of their own—that hiding-place of spirituality had, ere this, been overrun with formalism.

In God's name, let us build our breakwaters against the floods of corruption. I have tried to show that a sanctified university may become such a breakwater. With this view, we who are in Cumberland University, and they, too, who are in our colleges, are toiling. The idea that a college is a mere local or personal enterprise is exceedingly strange!

Our first college and its successors were established by the Church, certainly not for mere personal considerations.

The men who spent their days toiling for our colleges lived or died a piecemeal martyrdom. Any one of them, from first to last, could have improved his salary by going into a private school.

Any professor, in any unendowed college, could better his position by going into a private school, simply because private schools permit one man to teach all sorts of classes, and any number of them, whether he is competent or not; no matter even if he reduces his recitations to twenty minutes each. I know one man, now, who is teaching more pupils than four of our college-professors teach. He gets all the pay himself, and he has no "dead-heads."

Our Church-colleges are either for the benefit of the Church and the public, or else, they are a cruel imposition on the noble men who have been persuaded into such toil and sacrifices for them. Under the earnest and deep conviction that the Church cannot do without them, men toil on, and hope, and wait.

Let us look at the matter squarely. Suppose the professors abandon all our colleges; no more of this life-long struggle for enterprises that the Church will not sustain; no college left; no place to educate our sons or our ministry. What influence would that have on the standing of our Church? How long before we would lose all our best young men? How long before we would be destitute of an efficient and genuine Cumberland Presbyterian ministry?

When Dartmouth College was sending agents to Europe, Gen. Washington, Dr. Franklin, John Adams, and other leading men in different States, wrote letters to their friends in Europe commending the enterprise. When the Waldensian Churches were struggling to rear their college, leading men in England, though members of a different Church, raised large subscriptions to help them.

When Harvard College was in one of its dark periods, and sent out its imploring cries for help, a sister colony levied a tax on its pioneer corn-crop to aid the enterprise. Now, if true men and true patriots thus view the value of the college, how shall the very Church that planted the institution, the Church that needs a college more than all the other Churches of the world put together, how shall it be indifferent to its own college, and turn its offspring off, as the ostrich of the desert does, as soon as it comes into life? I say our Church needs a college more than all other Churches, because we really have no literature. We have never been represented before the world. We are beginning, just beginning, to send out one or two standard books. There is a vast work yet to be done. Other Churches are already safely lodged in the world's literature.

General action is needed. A few poor but generous men may have done all they could, but their contributions were but "the drop in the bucket." A college is a vast enterprise. The United States gives hundreds of thousands of dollars *every year* to carry on its military academy. The last catalogue of that institution shows that its allowance for the year was over \$300,000. The United States Observatory alone costs the nation about one-third of a million of dollars annually.

When, recently, Dr. McCosh took charge of Princeton College, an old and well-endowed institution, as was thought, his European ideas caused him to cry out for larger facilities. He did not cry in vain. The presidential chair was immediately and amply endowed; a splendid house for the president was built; two men, in answer to his earnest call, gave \$10,000 a piece for a college-gymnasium; and still the doctor continues his calls. "The friends of Princeton must come forward at this time to uphold her. . . . One whom God has blessed," he goes on, "must endow other chairs; another, rear more buildings; another, enlarge the apparatus; another, do other works."

General action, even from the poor, will make our colleges a success. The tax of one peck of corn on the poor colonists of Massachusetts saved Harvard College, and attracted noble gifts, even from England. The Northern Presbyterian Church raised, last year, for education \$361,879, nearly \$4,000 to each Presbytery.

The appeal of Bishop Chase for Kenyon—"Let every one that reads send Kenyon College a dollar"—brought eleven thousand dollars from the Churches, and went thrilling away over the Atlantic, calling forth responses there. Another written appeal brought \$54,000, and yet it all came in small gifts, mostly from the poor people. One little girl in England wrote a touching letter in response to the calls of that college, which aided in enlisting help even from children. Now, whoever you are that reads this article, set apart a little sum for some one of our colleges, and send it to that college at once.

CLOSING APPEAL.—The theme which I have been discussing has inexhaustible stores of facts, arguments, and interests, but the patience of the reader has been sufficiently taxed. I commit the little series to God and to my Church, with one closing appeal. *I appeal to the ministry.* The most solemn of all earthly vows are those which we are under to God and his Church. The responsibilities upon us are equal in solemnity. The ministry must lead and train the Churches in all their Christian duties, or else the Churches will die. If there is to be general coöperation with the Assembly's measures, it must be brought about by the influence of the pastors. If there is

to be system introduced in our benevolence, the pastors must accomplish it. If the people are ever to be trained to *large* benevolence, the preachers must do that training. If the throng of candidates for the ministry now seeking an education are ever to be furnished for their work, not only in literature, but in spiritual and theological training, the ministry must be the leading agents in all this. It is my honest conviction that if the ministry were to cease their exertions for five years, the Church would die.

Believing that the Church-college is just as vital an interest as Father Donnell represented it when he declared, "*Without it we cannot prosper as a body,*" looking with anxious hope on what we have at stake here, where I see fifty odd Cumberland Presbyterian candidates for the ministry, and listen to their prayers and gaze upon their tears in their daily prayer-meeting, I make my appeals to all true, spiritual ministers of my Church, old and young; brethren, help!

My next appeal is to our alumni. In this I would include the *alumni* of all departments of this and all our Church-colleges. There are those on whom all my praises of college-literature are thrown away; mere nominal students, who have been

But voyaging along the barren coasts
Like some poor, ever-roaming horde of pirates,
That, crowded in the rank and narrow ship,
House on the wild wave with wild usages,
Nor know aught of the main land. . . .
Whate'er in the inland dales the land conceals
Of fair and exquisite. O nothing, nothing,
Do they behold of that in their rude voyage!

—Schiller's *Picolomini*.

Or those not even nominal students, who remind us of Wordsworth's description of the long-lost earl whom the minstrel tried in vain to arouse to noble deeds like those of his ancestors:

Alas, the fervent harper did not know
That for a tranquil soul the lay was framed,
Who, long compelled in humble walks to go,
Was softened into feeling, soothed and tamed.

But you know the wealth that hides in learning's deep

abyss. You know, too, that all that wealth is the accumulated result of ages upon ages of thought. The genius of a thousand years ago has its record there. How great, then, is the obligation of those who now keep these accumulated stores to hand them on down to other ages.

(This argument is borrowed from Dr. Verplanck.)

I desire, before closing this series, to express my deep gratitude to the Presidents of the American Colleges all over the land, for the vast amount of valuable college-information which they have so courteously furnished me.

Alumni of Cumberland Presbyterian colleges, the cause of learning in our Church cries out to you for help; pointing you to the well-known stores of literature which must perish from our midst unless transmitted by your help; pointing you to the bright, youthful eyes that look out from immortal intellects which need to be developed. Learning cries to you for your share in these noble deeds which it is the birthright of real scholarship to exhibit. I need not for you run over the glorious annals of such deeds. With what undying love the noble *alumni* of Harvard and of Yale have fostered those institutions! If they traveled abroad, gifts, books, works of art, minerals, curiosities, came regularly back. If they toiled at home, part of their noble earnings came regularly to the college. If they won influence, it was always used for their *Alma Mater*. Look at Daniel Webster's defense of Dartmouth College. Can you, without emotion, read Goodrich's history of that scene in the Supreme Court when that noble orator moved the stern chief-justices to tears as he closed his immortal argument for his *Alma Mater*? I call on you for one prompt and noble struggle now, to lift our colleges up from the ruins where the war has placed them. I know I shall not call in vain. To-day, the silent columns of that proud old building, where many of your youthful hearts first thrilled with the noble impulses of the true student, stand mournfully over a scene of desolations. A few small buildings on other well-chosen spots now accommodate the university. But O what pressing wants remain! Shall these wants for ever bear down our spirits? Shall all those ministers who once were nurtured at the flowing breasts, the *euro*

thele, of this noble *Alma Mater*, forget their mother in her afflictions?

By each soft gale that memory brings from the spicy islands of classic song, by each mental triumph won at the bar, by each element of mental manhood that lifts you above your neighbor, I appeal to the *alumni* of this university to rally now to the rescue.

Propositions to remove the university to other towns have been repelled in every case. Fallen Troy fled with her shattered gods to Italy, but the Jew, trusting in Jehovah for his God, rebuilt his burnt temple on the same old sacred mount. We, trusting in the same Jehovah, will rebuild here. Not, truly, the same old house, for that does not suit us, but a number of houses over the town, and, some day or other, one of these upon the same old hill where your society-halls used to ring with your youthful oratory. I was not one of the favored ones who met you there, either as teacher or fellow-student. My *Alma Mater* is a "*fuit Illion*," save only that life she has lingering in the hearts of her children.

Alumni of old Cumberland College, let us re-kindle the old Erodolphian fires on the spot to which the General Assembly chose to transfer our altars. How many of those old Cumberland College *alumni* will meet me around those transferred altars next Commencement-day, there to plight anew some of our youthful vows—there to kindle anew some of the holy fires of our youthful enthusiasm?

ART. III.—*A Practical Exposition of Zechariah vi. 12, 13.*

"Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord: Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both."

THE temple of Jerusalem which Solomon erected, was the

most magnificent building on which the sun had ever shone. After it was finished and richly furnished, it was solemnly consecrated to the worship of Israel's God.

Every devout Jew loved the promised land—the land flowing with milk and honey—because the City of the Great King was there—that city which had salvation for its walls and bulwarks. They loved the city of Jerusalem because of its temple, and they loved the temple because of its sacred and solemn worship. They loved to worship within its consecrated walls, because of its holy place and its Holy of Holies. And they loved these because of the revelations and manifestations which He who dwelt between the cherubim there made of himself. There the Holy One of Israel dwelt; there the presence of Jehovah filled the house.

That temple, however, splendid and magnificent though it was, became a ruin and a desolation when the King of Babylon carried the Jews into captivity for their unbelief, ingratitude, and idolatry. They needed this chastening-rod of affliction to bring them to a renewed sense of their obligations, and to wean them from their besetting sin. The hearts of the best of them were bruised, and crushed, and broken with anguish when they thought of their former privileges in the land of their fathers, and of their exile and bondage in Babylon.

They loved the service of the temple, its music, its songs, its sacrifices; and they doubtless longed for the seventy long, weary years of their captivity to pass away, that they might again tune their harps and sing the songs of Zion in their own land; for they neither would nor could do this in exile, as their spirits were crushed, and they had no heart to do it. Psalm cxxxvii. is a beautiful and truly touching description of their feelings at this period, and brings before our minds the essential elements of true patriotism: "By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof. For there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion. How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remem-

ber thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

Doubtless many of the captives died in exile; but a goodly number who had seen and worshiped within the walls of Solomon's Temple lived to return; and we learn from the Book of Ezra that when they saw the foundations of the second temple laid, the old men wept with a loud voice, while the younger portion of the congregated multitude shouted for joy.

In the sixth year of the reign of Darius, King of Persia, the house of the Lord was finished, according to the commandment of the God of Israel; and the children of Israel, the priests, the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of the house of God with joy.

We know from the minor prophets that it was with difficulty, and after long delay, that this great and good work was accomplished. Haggai was inspired to arouse the people to rebuild the temple, though they never could restore its former magnificence. "Speak now to Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah, and to Joshua, the son of Josedech the high-priest, and to the residue of the people, saying, Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? And how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing? Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord, and be strong, O Joshua, the son of Josedech, the high-priest, and be strong all ye people of the land, saith the Lord, and work: for I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts." Do not faint or be discouraged, as if he had said to them, I will be with you, I will fulfill all my Messianic promises, the great deliverer shall appear, the true builder of the spiritual temple shall come and stand within these very walls, and fill this house with his glory. That all this, and much more than all this, was in the heart and on the lips of the inspired prophet when urging the people to strong faith and prompt action is evident from the beautiful and heart-stirring prediction which follows in the same chapter of the Book of Haggai, "And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is

mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts, and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts."

In nothing could the second temple excel the first in glory except in the personal presence of the "Desire of all nations"—the long-promised deliverer, the Messiah—he who is the true *shekinah*, or visible glory, the glory of the Lord; he in whom "dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily"—"God manifest in the flesh." From this prophecy it is as clear as a ray of light that "the Desire of all nations" was to come while the second temple was still standing; and, therefore, it follows that the Divine man of Nazareth was he; for the second temple in which, as the Prince of Peace, he preached peace and reconciliation with God, has been utterly destroyed for the last eighteen hundred years.

We are now in some measure prepared to look at a few of the many delightful truths that are brought before our attention in the rich, the lofty, and the somewhat figurative representation which is here given of the person, the work, and the glory of the Messiah. "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The Branch."

The speaker of the words is the LORD OF HOSTS—Jehovah himself. He who is the self-existent One. He who made all the hosts of heaven—those millions upon millions of stars that are marshaled like mighty armies on the fields of immensity. He who made them and upholds them by the word of his power. He who manages and controls them, and calls them all by their names, stoops down to speak to us. The speaker is not only the monarch of the material universe; but angels, principalities, and powers in heavenly places, are his hosts, and they are under his control, doing his bidding always. Those beings, who excel in strength, delight to listen to his voice, and execute his will; surely, then, we should be all ear to hear what the mighty monarch of the sky has to say when he stoops down from his lofty throne to speak to us who dwell on his footstool. He is interested in our well-being, and anxious to arrest and attract our attention, for he says, "Behold the man whose name is The Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place."

It is quite clear that this language cannot refer to Joshua, the high-priest, unless as a figure of the coming one; nor to Zerubbabel, for they were there, in actual service, and not expected, at some future time, to grow up out of their place.

And it is still more evident that there can be no reference to Solomon, who built the first temple, because when the Book of Zechariah was written, and the second temple building, that illustrious king had been nearly five hundred years numbered with the dead. A greater than Solomon is here presented to our view, for the language can only, with propriety, be applied to the Messiah. It is of the second Adam, "the Lord from heaven," that the speaker speaks. It is of the woman's seed, the predicted, promised, long-looked-for man—the mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus, that the Divine Father speaks when he says "Behold the man whose name is The Branch, and he shall grow up out of his place."

The names and titles which are given to the Lord Jesus Christ in Scripture are, as every one knows, very numerous and very significant. He is called the "Second Adam," "The Second Man," "The Amen," "The Alpha and Omega," "The Consolation of Israel," "The Captain of our Salvation," "Emmanuel," "The King of Israel," "The King of Kings," "The Prince of Peace," "The Prince of Life," "The plant of Renown," "The root of Jesse," "The root and the offspring of David," "The bright and the morning star," "The Sun of Righteousness." These, and a multitude of other names no less significant, are applied to him in the sacred volume. In the passage under consideration, his name is The Branch. Also in Isaiah iv. 2, we have the same word employed to designate the Messiah, "In that day shall The Branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel." Again, in Isa. xi., "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." The Messiah is here designated The Branch,

probably to indicate his promised descent from the royal family of David on the human side of his complex personality. The root of Jesse might appear to human eye dry and even dead before the promise was fulfilled, but as the mouth of the Lord had spoken it, The Branch of the Lord, the righteous Branch, would spring out of the very tribe and family foretold, when the fulness of the time arrived. Indeed, the very place where David's son, successor, and superior would be born was pointed out in Old Testament prophecy, as well as the offices which he was to fill, and the work he was to do in the economy of grace when he appeared. "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

That this Branch of righteousness, beautiful and glorious, grew up out of his place, is too evident from the gospel-history to need either proof or remark here. The four gospels are sufficient testimony to the fact. Let us, therefore, proceed to look at the *work which the man whose name is The Branch was sent to do.*

He came into our world to build a temple; a beautiful, spiritual temple; a large, living, durable temple; a temple of spiritual worshipers; a temple in which the Trinity in unity might forever dwell. This was one of the grand and glorious ends for which the Son of God became incarnate.

The building is in the process of erection; its walls are rising heavenward, and shall be, when completely finished and adorned, all-glorious without, and all-glorious within—the perfection of beauty, the masterpiece of divine workmanship, the wonder of creation, the center of attraction, the monument and memorial of redemption, and the university of the universe.

But to rear such a temple as this required humiliation, condescension, and a combination of peculiar qualifications. It required human and divine love, human and divine sympathy, wisdom, and power. It required every moral excellence, at once human, superhuman, and divine. To remove the difficulties which stood in the way was far too great a task for the highest

and the holiest archangel in the heaven of heavens to achieve. Though the cherubim and seraphim surround Jehovah's throne, and though they excel in strength, twelve legions of them would have been inadequate to meet and remove the difficulties which lay in the way. The Word must become flesh, divinity must assume humanity, in order successfully to accomplish this difficult and desirable work. To lay even the foundation on which such an edifice might securely rest was no easy task. But in the councils of eternity the man who is Jehovah's fellow undertook the difficult, indispensable, but delightful work. "Behold the man whose name is The Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, even he shall build the temple of the Lord."

I assume that the Temple of the Lord here spoken of is just another name for the Church of Christ. In the days of his incarnation and humiliation, Jesus, by his great propitiation for the sins of the world, laid a deep and solid foundation for the erection of this temple, this spiritual house. "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation." "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." The passages which we have just quoted clearly show that, in the economy of redemption, the divine Father has constituted Christ the foundation of the Church. He is the rock, the rock of ages, the ground of our salvation, peace, hope, and complete redemption. All the living stones of this spiritual house rest upon him, are united by a true and living faith to him, derive their life and polish and beauty from union with him. Hence the language of the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are built together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

Not only has the man, whose name is The Branch, by his

propitiation laid a durable ground on which a spiritual house, an holy temple, might be raised—not only is he the foundation which has been laid in Zion—but he is the BUILDER as well as the *foundation* on which the building rests. The language, it is true is figurative, but it is transparent and significant. “He shall build the temple of the Lord, even he shall build the temple of the Lord.” He has for many ages past been engaged upon it. It is his work, his business; and in the doing of this work he is also about his Father’s business. He has for many centuries been, by the manifestation of his love, by the attractions of his cross, by the influences of his Spirit, by the preaching of his truth, drawing many rough stones from the quarry of nature, that they might be vitalized and polished and purified, and they have become a part of this spiritual temple. He is now in the act of building this living temple, through the instrumentality of the glorious gospel of his grace, proclaimed by his ministers in all lands, and through the medium of grand manifestations which are yet to be made, he will go on and on with the good and gracious work until the last stone shall be placed in the building, with shoutings of “Grace, grace unto it.”

The work may progress slowly, the obstacles in the way may be great and formidable, the difficulties to be overcome arising from the moral and spiritual nature of the undertaking, and the wickedness, waywardness, and obstinacy of the human heart; but, notwithstanding all this, we know that he who has begun to build has counted the cost, and is able to finish the transcendently glorious house. He has resources upon which to draw, and can neither fail nor be discouraged until he has consummated his wondrous mediatorial undertaking. The carnal eye may not see the walls of our spiritual Zion rising; indeed, it is quite reasonable that the natural man should not discern the things of the Spirit. They may even appear foolishness unto him. But the work is going on, and the wise, the skillful, the great and gracious head of his body, the Church, shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. “He shall build the temple of the Lord, even he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory.” “Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the

gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi. 18). "Our Saviour means that his true Church, founded on the rock of ages, and built of living stones—stones hewn from the very rock on which his temple and his city are reared—will never succumb to death and destruction. As he looked around him, and as he gazed into the future, he saw ruin and desolation everywhere. All idol temples either had been destroyed or would be destroyed. All cities of the unclean either had sunk into ruin or would yet be numbered with the things that were. But the city of the living God, the General Assembly and Church of the first-born of the children of men, would defy forever every agency of destruction."*

O how delightful to know that no weapon that is formed against Christ or Christianity shall prosper. How delightful to know that no war waged against the captain of our salvation shall or can be successful. How delightful to know that Christ is the foundation on which the Church is built, and that Christ himself is the builder; that the Church is Christ's Church. He is peculiarly interested in all the stones of this spiritual house, whether they be large or small, rough or smooth; whether they occupy a prominent or obscure position in the building. The expression, "And he shall bear the glory and shall sit and rule upon his throne," is full of significance. No tongue can describe the greatness, the honor, the thanksgiving, the praise, and the glory which shall be given to the Messiah for his mediatorial work. The divine Father has said respecting him: "His enemies will I clothe with shame, but upon himself shall his crown flourish." We know that "God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." He who bore the cross shall forever wear the crown of glory. He has been exalted as Mediator far above all principality and power and might and dominion. On his head are many clustering honors. He is at his Father's right hand in the highest heaven, and the ransomed from all lands, and nations, and dispensations, and

* Commentary on Matthew, by Dr. Morrison, p. 309.

kingdoms, shall forever and ever give glory to the prince of the kings of the earth, "the King of kings and the Lord of lords." They will count it a high and delightful privilege to honor him who so richly deserves to bear the glory. Yes, that redeemed multitude which no man can number will cheerfully and joyfully bow before him, and cast their crowns at his feet, exclaiming, "Thou art worthy to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." The angels, too, who never sinned, who have always been citizens of the New Jerusalem, shall worship and adore the King of Saints, the Lamb in the midst of the throne. When they with clear eye and mighty intellect contemplate the great and grand work which the Man, whose name is The Branch, has done—when they look at the victory over sin which the Captain of our salvation has achieved—when they behold the magnificent spiritual temple which he has built and beautified, sparkling with polished stones—stones so precious that they have received the name of Jehovah's jewels—can they possibly remain silent and unmoved while all the countless multitudes of the redeemed around the throne are singing the new and everlasting song? No, they will sing as they never sung before, and all the palace of the King of Kings will be filled with the sweetest melodies. "He shall bear the glory." "And he shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." There is doubtless reference in this to Melchisedek, who was both king of righteousness and priest of the most high God at the same time. As a King, the Messiah has been exalted far above the kings of Israel, and as a priest far above any of the sons of Aaron, for he is superior to and exalted infinitely above even Melchisedek, who filled both the regal and the sacerdotal office. The same important and delightful truth is clearly taught in a number of the Messianic Psalms. For example, in *Psa. cx. 4*, "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek." Even Rosenmüller, though exceedingly slow to believe that the testimony of Christ is the spirit of prophecy, in the second edition of his "*Commentary on the Psalms*," admits

that this passage "applies with much greater propriety to the Messiah" than to King David. In his introduction to the Messianic Psalms, Hengstenburg says that the fourth verse of Psalm cx. furnishes a strong proof in favor of this interpretation. There God confirms it by an oath, that this king shall be also a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek, who, according to Gen. xv. 10, united in his own person the regal and the priestly dignity. In this declaration a total change in the previous condition of things is implied. For, according to the Mosaic constitution, the priesthood was exclusively confined to the family of Levi, during the existence of the old covenant, and how carefully God watched over the preservation of this arrangement was shown in earlier times by the fate of the company of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and afterward by that of King Uzziah, who was smitten with an incurable leprosy while intruding upon the priestly office, by burning incense in the temple. The Man, then, whose name is The Branch, is exalted far above all other men, far above all other kings; and this king, Messiah, is a priest upon his throne. He is at once King of kings, and the great High-priest of our profession, who ever liveth to make intercession for us. He has been exalted far above all the kings of the earth, and he shall reign prosperously forever and ever. As it is expressed in Psa. lxxii., "In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him. All nations shall serve him." In another Messianic Psalm, he is designated "the King of Glory." Soon after the High-priest of our profession had finished the great propitiation on Calvary for the sins of the world, he ascended to his mediatorial throne. Myriads of angelic hosts attended him on his ascent, and as they drew near the far-shining palace they shouted, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in." He has long since entered in and taken his seat at his Father's right hand, in the highest

heaven. It is delightful to know that the Captain of our Salvation has been invested with all power in heaven and on earth, and that every knee shall yet bow down to him, and every tongue confess that he is Lord.

The closing words of the passage under consideration have been variously interpreted—"And the counsel of peace shall be between them both." That is, say some, there shall be harmony—perfect harmony—between the kingly office and the priestly office of the Messiah in his prosperous reign. Other interpreters suppose that the reference is to the peace effected by Christ between Jewish and Gentile believers. Eph. ii. 14-18, and kindred passages, are referred to as proof. There can be no theological objections urged against either of the above interpretations, for they express important truth. But I apprehend that the truth here taught is, that the counsel of peace spoken of is between Jehovah, who speaks, and the man whose name is The Branch, about whom he speaks. Between the Divine Father and the Divine Son, in the whole economy of grace and redemption, there is, and shall for ever be, the most perfect peace, and unity, and love.

ART. IV.—*On the Mode of Baptism.*

I HAVE been required by a resolution of the Marshall Presbytery, to write a short essay on the *Mode of Christian Baptism*, which is hereby presented.

The word *Baptism* is said to be derived from the Greek *Baptisma*, or *Baptizo*, and more remotely from *Bapto*, which properly signifies a washing, by pouring, sprinkling, or immersion; which general interpretation has given rise to the questions, How is this religious rite to be administered? Which of these meanings of interpretation is to be selected as the proper mode of administration? Must the water be applied to the subject, or the subject to the water? In our examination of this subject, in the very commencement, it

would appear that divine wisdom, in placing an ordinance in the Church for universal observance by the membership of said Church, as the appointing power, who instituted the Church and her ordinances, would not make an appointment and requirement which could not be complied with under all circumstances, wherever there was water, a subject, and a proper administrator. This is certainly a fair and just conclusion. But is it not a fact that must be apparent to every observing mind, that there have been, and will continue to be, localities, situations, and circumstances, where this sacred rite cannot be administered by immersion? What then must be done to meet the divine command? The commission to baptize is imperative, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," etc. (Matt. xxviii.) Would it meet the command given, to put up the plea that there are some conditions in which a proper subject may be placed, that the divine rite cannot be administered? Did not the Head of the Church know when he gave the commission, that such impossibilities would occur if immersion was to be the only mode of administration? and would he, who is infinitely wise and good, give a command for general observance which he knew could not be complied with? And would it be reasonable to suppose that man, a finite being, was authorized to make such restrictions in the administration of a divinely-ordained rite as would meet the command? Who gave him such authority? Is it in the commission? Not a word of it. Did the Head of the Church make any exceptions to time, place, or circumstances, when he gave the command? Not even an intimation. But on the contrary, it is as clearly annunciated as language can express it, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." And the general observance of the divine ordinance is so clearly and positively enjoined, that no person or sect has any right or authority to restrict the administration of the great commission to meet peculiar opinions with regard to the mode of administering this divinely-authorized rite.

Let us not forget the position assumed. It is essential to the proper understanding of a question that has long agitated the Christian world. It is not to be passed over as one of the inexplicable difficulties. This sacrament was instituted and

placed in the Church for a great practical purpose; and it is surely, to say the least of it, a great assumption of power to dictate to the Head and King of Zion when and how it must be administered, and when it may be omitted. The great difficulty has originated, not with regard to the appointment of the ordinance. There is no trouble about that. But the trouble is in properly administering the ordinance—in assuming a mode that is impracticable, and that necessarily abridges the great commission.

There is no abridgment when we are permitted to administer the ordinance by pouring or sprinkling. It may be performed in all latitudes, and under all circumstances. It is just as practical, suitable, and attended with as little embarrassment as teaching. One can be performed with as much readiness as the other. Both are required in the commission, and both should be observed. These conclusions are surely legitimate and scriptural; and it does appear to me that nothing but a determination on the part of the immersionist to bolster up his adopted theory in the face of reason and argument, has led him to strange extremes.

But I infer the correctness of the position assumed from another consideration. The Head of the Church, in giving directions for its organization under its present form, placed in the Church two sacraments of great value and significance—viz.: Baptism and the Lord's-supper—to be observed by all the membership of his Church. They were to be signs and symbols of two great events, and would give visibility to the membership of the Church, as distinguished from the world, and, as already noticed, were to be of general observance by all the followers of Christ. In giving command for the administration of the Lord's-supper, no restrictions are thrown around it, or even contemplated, so far as time, place, or position of the body is concerned. It can be administered on the mountain-top, in the valley low, in prison, in the family, or on a sick-bed. Why this difference, when both ordinances are of divine appointment, and require equal observance? Why so much more difficult to attend to the ordinance of Baptism than the Supper? Simply because, according to the immersionist's theory, the rite has to be

administered in a certain mode, and if not administered in that mode, it is no baptism; while, on the other hand, the Supper may be administered standing, sitting, or kneeling—in the church-house or out of it, in the family-residence or out of it. Wherever there is a fit communicant, elements, and a proper administrator, there the Supper may be administered. Not so in administering the ordinance of Baptism by immersion. You must construct a pool, or have a stream sufficiently large and deep to cover the body all over in water—*all over*. Not even a small part of the person may be left exposed or uncovered, which is often entirely impracticable. From these plain, practical truths, I object to the mode of administering the ordinance of Baptism by immersion, and prefer pouring or sprinkling, as more practicable, and in harmony with the whole gospel plan.

The great condition of salvation is faith, which may be exercised in all latitudes, conditions, and situations in life. Water-baptism is only a sign or symbol of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which latter takes place whenever a man exercises true, scriptural faith. A change of heart, or regeneration, follows as the result of Holy Ghost baptism, which may and will be administered whenever or wherever the man submits to the terms proposed in the gospel. No difference where he may be, whenever the terms are complied with he is saved, "For he that believeth shall be saved." The great work is then done, and should he be called immediately to his eternal account, he would stand acquitted in the presence of the Judge, and receive his great reward, whether water-baptism had been administered or not. Then why place so much stress upon a certain mode, as if the sign was really more valuable, or of more importance than the thing signified? Does any person believe that water-baptism is equal to regeneration in the great work of redemption? Will water-baptism save a guilty sinner? Surely not. No Baptist, with all his devotion to his particular mode, contends for such great efficacy in immersion. And yet the tenacity with which he holds to his mode, the parade he makes in preparing to follow his Lord into the watery grave, the efforts he uses to press his theory and enlist followers, and last, but by no

means least, his exceeding sensitiveness when the authority for his particular mode is called in question, all go to make the impression that the mode is the great consideration. I know they are unwilling to acknowledge it, but acts speak louder than words. I know that what I am saying is the truth, because I have seen it and heard it again and again. And any unprejudiced mind acquainted with the practices and arguments of the immersionists, must acknowledge the same fact. From this very consideration, that the mode of the immersionist gives more prominence to the sign than to the reality itself, I object to it. Its tendency is to ritualism, which places spirituality in the background, and holds a rite or ceremony, which is nothing but a sign, above the essential and regenerating power of the Holy Ghost. This truth will appear still more striking when we recollect that the work of the Spirit in regeneration, which is the essential and saving work, is not restricted to any locality—no waiting to hunt for a baptistery or stream of water—no postponement of this great work for suitable clothing or a genteel outfit—no calling the Church together to witness the administration of a ceremony which has always appeared to me burdensome and unmeaning. In the administration of this ordinance by immersion, scenes, by no means inviting or becoming, have been witnessed in more instances than one. No delay nor authority to postpone the sinner's return to God—no procrastination is even hinted at or encouraged in the Bible, but the great truth is annunciated in thunder-tones, "Now is the accepted time," and "To-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." No waiting for a more convenient season, or suitable place, nor any such conditions are contemplated in the commission; and no minister, engaged in his appropriate work, would dare to encourage such delay. The direct conditions are, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." The idea is that so soon as he believes, the sign, or water-baptism, if it has not been administered, should be attended to at once, or with as little delay as possible. The sign, as it is not the saving power, may be administered before or after regeneration; before, by believing parents entering into covenant engagements for their children.

The true, scriptural process is, that all adults, who have not been dedicated to God in infancy by baptism, should, when they believe, be baptized with water, without ceremonious delay, which can only be done by pouring or sprinkling the water on them, which is a true and significant sign of Holy Ghost baptism, by which the heart is cleansed when they believe.

I would not object to the immersionist's theory, if I were convinced that it was the true, scriptural process. With all its burdens, embarrassments, and delays, I would embrace it with all my heart. I do not object to burdens in their proper place, neither am I afraid of being covered all over in water, if that was the scriptural mode of baptism. Pedobaptists have been charged with pride, timidity, and a want of courage in refusing to go down into the water, which is not the fact. It is for the want of "Thus saith the Lord." And just here, permit me to say, I think that Pedobaptists will compare favorably in the exhibition and cultivation of all the graces which adorn and beautify the Christian character with their exclusive neighbors, although they have not been immersed in water. My objection, I repeat, is to the impracticability of such a mode, its unscriptural tendency, and the fanatical importance attached to it. Regeneration fits a man for heaven, makes him a member of the Church triumphant, opens the doors of the celestial communion to all who truly desire to enter the upper sanctuary. The Word of God says: "And the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them to living fountains of water." That is surely the Bible theory. But the Baptist theory is: No difference if you are regenerated and fit for heaven, you must be immersed, or you cannot partake of the Lord's-supper with a Baptist. You must stand aside, although, if you were in heaven, you would sit down with all the redeemed. What! Is there more purity in the Baptist Church than in heaven?

But still more: if you are a minister of the gospel in good-standing in your particular Church, yet, if you have not been immersed by a Baptist minister, you are not only unfit for the communion, but unfit to enter the sacred pulpit, as a mouth for God, in a Baptist Church. You may be a man of God,

and when done with your work on earth, may have stars in your crown of rejoicing forever and ever, yet it all amounts to nothing with the Baptists, so far as Church privileges are concerned, if their particular mode of water-baptism has not been attended to. I, therefore, object to a mode which teaches and tends to such unscriptural distinctions, when true believers "are all one in Christ," which says to a Pedobaptist, "sit thou there, or stand here, for I am more holy than thou." This preference or high standing is all assumed upon the condition that the *sign* of Holy Ghost baptism is administered in a certain manner. Now, the importance attached to that certain manner or mode gives prominence to the *sign*, above the work signified, which, according to my humble conception of the gospel-plan, detracts from the perfection, harmony, and inestimable value of a genuine Christianity. Surely, regeneration should be first, and should occupy our highest consideration; and yet the importance attached to water-baptism by immersionists makes it secondary.

These apparent inconsistencies and difficulties, which have long perplexed the membership of the Church, often involving bitter controversy with regard to the proper mode of administering water-baptism, have originated from what was conceived to be the true and scriptural meaning of this sacred ordinance, while a few plain, scriptural facts, it appears to me, ought long since to have settled the controversy. Now, let the Bible be its own interpreter—no difference what learned lexicographers may say with regard to the literal meaning of the word *baptize*. If the Bible *defines* it to mean pouring, what if a thousand learned critics contend for a different meaning? Surely, if we believe the Word of God to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, its own interpretation stands permanent. Let us now notice what revelation teaches.

In our examination of this subject, with the Bible as our guide, we contend that water-baptism is not the true scriptural baptism. It is only the sign. It is an external sign, representing by water what is done internally by the true baptism of the Holy Ghost. It is said, "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

(Acts i. 5.) Now, is not the plain and literal meaning of this scripture that John's baptism with water represented the baptism of the Holy Ghost? And if so, it was only the sign or symbol of the true baptism. It surely can mean nothing else, as there was no saving power or value in it, only so far as it pointed out or shadowed forth the Holy Ghost baptism. Let us read it again, and try to understand the true meaning. "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Very well; all true, so far as John's mission extended. But does not every Bible-reader know that John's work was only preparatory, and had all its true value in what was to come after him? Truly, he occupied an important position; so much so, it is said, "that among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist." Yet notice what is farther said with regard to his position, "notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." From these facts, and a fair and honest consideration of their true import, I must think we have interpreted John's baptism correctly. It was only a sign or shadow of true scriptural baptism. John acknowledges this fact himself when "He preached, saying, there cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost. (Mark i. 7, 8.) Almost the same language is used by Matthew and Luke. Now, is it not the plain and scriptural meaning of these historical facts that John's baptism with water was preparatory to what was to come after him—was a sign or shadow (not the true substance) of the work of the Holy Spirit, which was to follow John's administration? And as John's baptism was a sign of the true baptism which was to come after him, so the Christian water-baptism is a sign of the same work of the Holy Spirit upon the heart at the present day, which is legitimate, and sustains the position we have assumed. An additional idea suggests itself here, that is, if John baptized with water before the Holy Ghost baptism was administered, why should it be considered so ridiculous and unscriptural for Pedobaptists to enter into covenant engagement with the Great Head of the

Church for their children, and have them baptized with water before conversion? Many of the subjects of John's baptism were as destitute of conversion, in the true scriptural sense, as the sucking babe. A change of heart or Holy Ghost baptism, can alone constitute true membership in Christ's spiritual kingdom, on earth or in heaven. A mere rite alone never can. Then let us not be alarmed when we have Bible precept and example for our acts.

Let us now inquire how this Holy Ghost baptism was administered, and if the Bible interprets it by pouring, and I, as a minister of God, commissioned to baptize in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, wish to represent it by water-baptism, which is the sign of the true Holy Ghost baptism, ought I not to pour the water on the subject, as the most scriptural and significant mode? Is not that a fair conclusion? How, then, was the Holy Ghost baptism administered? Turn to Acts ii., which is a true relation of the facts in the case, a revelation of that wonderful work which took place on the Day of Pentecost, a fulfillment of the truth delivered in the fifth verse of the preceding chapter: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." It was a powerful demonstration of Holy Ghost baptism; and Peter, in the same chapter, commencing with the fourteenth verse, revealed the mode of its administration: "But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and said unto them, Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words, for these are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day, but this is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will *pour* out of my spirit upon all flesh." Here the mode of administration was by *pouring*. "I will *pour* out of my spirit upon all flesh," is the language used, and the word *pour* explains how the work was done, which is called a baptism by the sacred writer, a plain declaration of the facts. Then away with the idea announced by learned divines that Scriptural baptism means immersion, and nothing but immersion, when we have just noticed that the Bible itself defines Holy Ghost baptism to be administered by pouring. Must we then

set aside the plain literal interpretation of the Bible and follow the teachings of learned critics? Who knows best, Infinite Wisdom, or finite, weak, and fallible men? I prefer to follow the former, and take the Bible as the man of my counsel. I am very sure that the Bible defines baptism to be done by pouring, from the fact that the word *pour* is used when the true baptism was to be administered. I know the objector defines the great work on the Day of Pentecost as miraculous, which is all true, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost was to endow the apostles with the gift of tongues. That was certainly a part of the work; but the great and essential work was the work of conversion, which resulted in adding to the Church three thousand souls. But let us not pass over the point we are contending for, the mode of administering baptism, and that the baptism administered on the Day of Pentecost was by *pouring*. In addition to what we have already noticed, let us go to the house of Cornelius, and learn how Holy Ghost baptism was performed there. Peter was again the leading speaker. Acts x., commencing with the thirty-fourth verse, we have a record of his sermon, and commencing with the forty-fourth verse, we have a record of the effect produced. "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was *poured* out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here again the word *poured* is used, conveying the same idea of the mode as on the Day of Pentecost. And that this is the true interpretation may be readily seen by the record in the following chapter, where Peter says: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them" (that is, those assembled at the house of Cornelius), "as on us at the beginning" (that is, as on the Day of Pentecost). "Then" (says Peter) "remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with *water*; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost," proclaiming, in language not to be misunderstood, that the great result produced on that occasion was the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which was to follow John's water-baptism. He continued: "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did

unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I should withstand God? When they heard these things they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." This was another great work of conversion. Peter, after witnessing such a wonderful work, said (v. 47), "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." That is, as they had received the internal work of baptism of the Holy Ghost in regenerating their hearts, the external sign should be publicly administered, which was water-baptism. And as it was designed to represent the Holy Ghost baptism, which, in the language of the sacred word, was administered by *pouring*, it is certainly conclusive to say that the water was poured on them. What other mode could be so clearly understood? In fact, no other mode was even hinted at. And it would be strange that after they had learned that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was administered by pouring, that they should choose a different mode, when no directions are given to change the mode in using the water.

For the above reasons I prefer, in administering the ordinance of baptism, to pour the water on the subject, as I certainly believe it to be more scriptural and significant than any other mode. In the discussion of this subject I have tried to use great plainness and fairness, desiring to present the plain, practical, and scriptural facts in the case, without any effort at speculation, so as to appear learned in biblical criticism, which, in my humble opinion, has involved this sacred rite in so much controversy. Do let us permit the Bible to be its own interpreter, and cease this protracted war about classical interpretation, when the pagan classics fail to convey the *true idea* of the rites and worship of the true God.

In making my closing argument, I object to the theory of the immersionist, in consideration of the meaning he attaches to the ordinance of water-baptism, which, in my humble opinion, lies at the very foundation of all the controversy concerning it. What was the design the great Head of the Church had in instituting this sacred rite? We have already noticed,

according to our interpretation, what water-baptism was designed to represent, that is, what we honestly believe it was to represent. But the immersionist contends that it is designed to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. We therefore object to such interpretation for the following reasons: When the Head of the Church placed but two standing ordinances in the Church, they were surely designed to represent two great and distinct *works*, accomplished by divine agency, and which no being but God himself could accomplish, both essential to man's salvation. In the first place, atonement must be made to satisfy the claims of the violated law. Blood must be shed of infinite value, or the atonement would be incomplete. No being but the Son of God, by uniting divinity with humanity, could make such an atonement, which was a most wonderful revelation, as no being but one of infinite wisdom and inexhaustible resources could ever have thought of such an undertaking. It was therefore a great work, one in which the whole race of man was deeply interested, and without which no man could be saved. "For, without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sins." This demand of the law was met by the death of Christ; his blood was spilt, an atonement made, and an offer of pardon secured to the guilty transgressor. The ordinance of the Supper was instituted to commemorate that great work. The symbols used were bread and wine, the bread to represent his body, his *broken body*, and the wine his blood, his *shed blood*. A very significant and commemorative ordinance.

But in order that the atonement made be complete and the Supper represent the whole truth, his life, sufferings, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, were all parts in the history of the atonement made by Christ, and essential to attest the truth of his mission. Had any of these points been wanting, the atonement would have been a failure, not because blood had not been shed, but because the being offered would have been wanting in those points of history essentially belonging to Christ's mission, and he could not have been considered the true and promised Messiah. We therefore contend that the Lord's-supper commemorates this whole work, as essen-

tial in making the atonement complete, and securing to man an offer of pardon.

In the second place, in order that man may be really saved, another great *work* must be done. The law may have been satisfied by the atonement made, and yet man, a corrupt sinner, be eternally lost. His moral nature must be changed, he must be regenerated. In the language of inspiration, he "must be born again," which work or change he is unable to accomplish of himself. The work must be done by divine grace and power. The work of the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Trinity, whose office it is to enlighten and change the heart by applying the benefits of the atonement to the guilty, condemned sinner, was essential, for without it all men would be lost. The mission of the Holy Spirit was therefore essential, and of as vital importance in the salvation of the sinner as the atonement. There could be no deliverance from the bondage of sin and corruption without both of these great works and agencies. The second and third persons in the Trinity, equal in wisdom and power, were both engaged in the work of man's salvation—one to atone, and the other to apply the benefits of the atonement; one to pay the price of violated law and offer pardon, and the other to baptize, regenerate, producing the new creature in Christ Jesus, enabling the heart to render willing and obedient service to the Lord in his spiritual kingdom. We therefore contend, according to our understanding of the great plan, that as the Supper commemorates the atonement, the first great work in man's redemption and is complete in its significance, embracing and comprehending all the parts of that great work, water-baptism commemorates the second great work, which is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and is equally complete in its true and proper significance. May I not ask, Is it consistent with Infinite Wisdom, and according to the mode of the divine administration, to place in the Church, under its present form, but two great ordinances, and these to represent or commemorate one and the same work, viz: the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, which finds its full representation in the Supper alone, by both of these ordinances, and leave the other great work, viz: the baptism of the Holy

Spirit, which is equally essential in man's salvation, without a rite to represent its true and proper mission? We think not. And such a course of procedure, to say the least of it, would appear rather strange. The great Head of the Church never acts without design, but in all the ages of the past in the history and revelations made concerning his Church, its organization, institutions, and laws, he always adopted the best means to secure the best end. Every rite and ceremony had a true and proper meaning. Every type and shadow was designed to train his people, strengthen their faith, and keep up in their minds the hope and character of the promised Messiah. And when he came, and all the types and shadows found a complete fulfillment in his mission, he then placed in his Church, under its present form, two lasting and commemorative ordinances, viz: Baptism and the Lord's-supper—the Supper to represent the atonement, the price paid for man's redemption, and baptism to represent the baptism of the Holy Spirit in applying the benefits of the atonement and changing the heart. This was evidently the great design, without any repetition or confusion of views as to the true and proper meaning of these sacred rites. True, more distant meanings may be applied to them, which has been done in many instances, but, in the institution of the Supper, the language used is, "Do this in remembrance of me," as if he had said, Never forget me—recollect that for you I have shed my blood, for you I have died, for you I have met the claims of the violated law, for you I have instituted this commemorative ordinance, representing the tragedy of Calvary, and my triumphs over the powers of death, hell, and the grave. And when he said, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," he designed that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, in regenerating the heart, and creating within it the powers of an endless life, should be represented by the sacred ordinance of water-baptism. Is not this the plain and scriptural design of these two great ordinances? Could their meaning be more significant? And could their true import be more weighty and forcible, and the great leading ideas in these sacred rites be more clearly revealed? I therefore believe,

and with good scriptural reasons, that these views are true, and that we should object to the meaning the immersionist gives to water-baptism.

ART. V.—*The Preparation of Sermons for the Pulpit.*

THE simple statement of the subject implies that a previous preparation for the delivery of sermons is necessary. A wise and judicious speaker will have his subject well matured previously to his appearance before a public audience. A congressman, once, during Daniel Webster's political career, in trying to get some measure through Congress, asked the great statesman to give it his approval in a short speech. But he declined, on the ground that he had not studied the question. The other urged his request by stating to Mr. Webster that his weight of character would carry it through. Mr. Webster still declined, and said to his friend that if he had any weight in Congress, it was because he never spoke on any question until he had studied and investigated it thoroughly. Virginia's great orator said of himself that, when he was expecting to appear before an audience as a public speaker, he studied his subject for days previous to the occasion. He said he wrote as much upon the subject as he had time to write, and that he revolved it in his mind, and, when he lay down at night, he thought it over and over again; "and then," says he, "when I have delivered my speech, the people call it Patrick Henry's genius." The truth is, it was Patrick Henry's thorough preparation for the occasion. We sometimes hear men quote, against previous preparation for preaching, the language of Christ to the apostles: "Take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye." (Mark xiii. 11.) But that is a misapplication of the meaning of Christ's language. He meant that when they were brought before kings and magistrates, and into the synagogues of the Jews, on account of his doctrine and

religion, they should have no defense previously made out. They were to be divinely inspired for the occasion. It is believed that it is of vital importance to the permanent success of the gospel, that thorough preparation be made for the delivery of sermons. The actual literal preaching of the gospel is the great means ordained of Heaven for the conversion of the world. A half-prepared and ill-digested sermon is intolerable. It is proposed, then, to investigate the question. In what does preparation for the delivery of sermons consist? Upon an answer to this question, it is likely that all would not agree and recommend the same course to be pursued. The writer lays down as a rule that, under all ordinary circumstances, the following is best:

I. To select a suitable text.

It is true some men select a subject and prepare their sermons accordingly, and then go to the Bible and hunt a text to suit the sermon. The plan of developing the sermon from the text is believed to be preferable. Whatever subject a man may wish to preach upon, he can find a text in the Bible from which it may be drawn in detail. There should be a natural and logical connection between the text and the sermon. The observance of this rule will aid the preacher very much in preparing his sermons, and his hearers equally as much in understanding and retaining them. Let the text suggest the sermon. When Philip was directed to "join himself" to the chariot of the eunuch, and heard him read in the prophecy of Isaiah, he "began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." (Acts viii. 35.) The doctrine he preached was legitimately drawn from the text. Had he preached any thing else, the text would not have been explained, nor his auditor edified and saved. It is very natural for a person when he hears the preacher read his text, to say in his own mind, "Now I want to hear that scripture explained," and he sometimes hears it, and sometimes he does not. The writer has more than once heard a preacher read a text which afforded ground enough for a good sermon, and was full of wholesome and edifying doctrine, and then deliver a discourse that would have suited any other text in the Bible as well as it did that one. When a preacher selects a text, it is not implied, nor is

it proper, that he should try to get every thing into his sermon that the text means, or that can be legitimately drawn from it. Let him present some appropriate points of doctrine, and even one leading thought alone, thoroughly discussed and illustrated.

Another advantage in preaching directly from a text is, that as the preacher is led to an immediate examination of the words and phrases contained in the passage, he is more likely to come at the truth as it was indited by the Holy Spirit. It is easier to make a sermon of general statements and loose phraseology than to dig it up out of the mines of truth, but it is not the safest. When statements are made, the author wishes them to be true, and in his anxiety may pervert the Scriptures to sustain them. The more strictly the text is drawn out and developed in the sermon, the more spiritual food and nourishment are furnished to the souls of the hearers. This seems to be Paul's idea, from his directions to Timothy: "Preach the word." (2 Tim. iv. 2.)

II. Close study is necessary in the preparation of sermons. This much is implied in what has already been said. To draw out the meaning of a text in a clear and lucid manner, requires thought and investigation. Paul says to Timothy: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." (2 Tim. ii. 15.) No man can be an efficient workman unless he is master of his profession. The work of the preacher is to be such as will be approved of God. The approval of God can only be had when his word is so preached as to be "rightly divided." "Rightly dividing the word of truth" requires all the skill and application that can be commanded. It is not dividing the truth from the error, for there is no error in it.

The Greek word rendered "rightly dividing," means to "pursue a proper course in the management or administration of any thing," and also embraces the idea of handling and administering the truth aright. Truth is to be administered for the instruction, edification, and comfort of the hearer, but sound discretion is required in determining what truth is applicable in given cases. There is an exhaustless

fountain of truth in the Bible, and the right and general dissemination of truth from that fountain will bring some comfort, at least, to every human being on the face of the globe. To do this work effectually, Paul admonished Timothy to "study." He says of himself that he had not handled "the word of God deceitfully," but by a proper manifestation of the truth had commended himself to "every man's conscience." The best preaching is truth made plain and forcible, and that, of course, must be in language easy of comprehension. I am not to be understood as saying that sermons must consist of Bible phraseology, but that they must consist of appropriate truth. God, ordinarily, blesses some simple word of truth in the conviction of the sinner. Sometimes it is one single word, or short sentence, in a sermon. "He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall, doubtless, come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." (Ps. cxxvi. 6.) The words, "Behold, now is the accepted time," being quoted by a preacher in his discourse, made such an impression upon the mind of one of his hearers, that he soon came to the minister, under deep conviction, seeking instruction in the way of life everlasting.

The fact must be recognized, in preparing for the pulpit, that the word of God is the sword of the Spirit. (Eph. vi. 17.) While we use the word of God, we must, in faith and prayer, trust him for an accompanying divine influence, that good may be accomplished. One may plant and another water, "but God giveth the increase;" and, unless God giveth the increase, the planting and watering come to naught. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." (Zech. iv. 6.) Another prophet says: "Truly I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord." (Micah iii. 8.) In both of these quotations the Spirit of the Lord is recognized as the great agent in the accomplishment of good. Paul says to the Thessalonians, "Brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it is with you." (2 Thess. iii. 1.) Paul was in one place, and the Thessalonians in another; and if their prayer was answered, it was by a divine influence from God upon the word preached by Paul which gave the increase. There is

no other sense in which their prayers could contribute to this end. The Apostle Peter (2 Peter iii. 15, 16) says of Paul, that he had, according to the wisdom given unto him, written some things hard to be understood, and that the unlearned and unstable wrest them, as they do the other scriptures, to their own destruction. From the very fact that there are scriptures hard to be understood, requires the closer application in the preparation of sermons. The truth must be brought out, although it may be difficult. "Buy the truth, and sell it not." (Prov. xxiii. 23.)

III. Let us consider the immediate preparation necessary for the delivery of the sermon from the pulpit. Should it be written out in full and read to the audience, or should the preacher prepare his notes, and have them before him while preaching, or should he prepare himself to speak *ex animo*?

To write out a sermon in full, with a view of reading to the congregation, is hardly admissible under any circumstances. There is no impropriety, but decided gain, in preparing careful notes of a discourse, not full enough to be read to the audience, nor to be committed to memory for declamation. The purpose is first to preserve the results of earnest toil; and secondly, the writing tends to fix the general subject in the mind, and also tends to accuracy of expression, all of which are desirable. The man who can preach by no other method than by reading full manuscript, must be permitted to employ thus the talent which God has given him. Let him be sure, however, that this is the case. The practice of writing the general divisions and subdivisions of the sermon, and then of elaborating the several divisions to some extent, is very commendable. This method, as a general thing, is thought to be preferable to any other. It is practicable, and requires a good deal of thought and study in arranging the material at hand to the best advantage. Some men study and mature their subjects, and make their arrangements in their heads, without committing any thing to paper. This is sometimes done successfully. But there is danger that such preachers will become too profuse in words, and too barren in thought. A certain writer says of public speakers not writing more, that it is an evil, "because it is evidently detrimental to systematic

thought, begets a diffuse, incoherent method of speaking, and is wanting both in elegance and terseness of diction."

It used to be the case, in our Church, that preachers had not the time to do much writing in the preparation of their sermons. When the circuit-riding system was practiced more than it is now, the general rule was to write but little. That suited the state of things then existing better than it does now. The man who preaches Sabbath after Sabbath, to the same people, needs something more regular and systematic. As a general rule, a man should adopt the plan of sermon-making by which he can be most successful as a preacher. It is advisable for a preacher not to wed himself to any one method, so that he can work by any other at will. I have in my mind a preacher, who was appointed to deliver a discourse at a meeting of his Presbytery, but he had to ride a distance of four miles to get a sermon. I know another who said, under the same circumstances, that he could not preach at all, because he had brought no sermon with him. These men prepared their sermons for delivery with the manuscripts before them. A preacher, by thus fettering himself, is subject to great inconvenience. He should practice different methods, and by this means develop the best talent he has.

We are now upon the point of digesting the sermon. Study and investigation bring together and cull the material; that is, by them it is masticated and digested. It is like the food upon the table ready for mastication. The food, properly masticated and digested, is healthy and nourishing, but without this disease is produced. It is much the same way with an undigested sermon. There may be material enough, but the mind of the preacher must take hold of it, revolve it, weigh it, arrange it, and master it completely before he is prepared to enter the pulpit and dispense the nourishing, saving truth. It is said of Rev. George Donnell, a man of power in the pulpit, that while preparing for the delivery of his sermons he read but little, but engaged in deep meditation, thoughtfulness, and prayer. There is nothing else that fits a man so well for his immediate appearance in the pulpit as these. St. Paul said of himself that he was "pressed in spirit." He felt the weight of responsibility resting upon

him; and until this is felt, no man is prepared to deliver his message of salvation to the people. The same apostle again exclaims, "Who is sufficient for these things?" In the preparation of sermons for the pulpit, the preacher is never to forget his need of that wisdom that cometh down from above. Especially is he to seek "an unction from the Holy One," that he may speak the word of truth, in the power and demonstration of the Spirit. He is to "speak as the oracles of God," and the more of the Spirit of God he possesses the more likely is he to do this. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God."

ART. VI.—*Creation.*

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

THIS short sentence contains three great facts: That the universe of matter and of mind is not eternal. That all things were created by God. That this work of creation was "in the beginning" of time. These are precisely the facts which the world never could learn without a direct revelation. As to the chronology of this "beginning," nothing is said. Taking this declaration by itself as an independent truth, there is not the least ground for even a conjecture as to the age of the world. It may be six thousand or six million years old. For ages, with few exceptions, the common Church faith was that the creation occurred about four thousand years before the birth of Christ. Since the wonderful discoveries of modern science, this particular dogma of Church faith has been greatly staggered. And, as might have been expected, infidelity seized upon these discoveries and hurled them with great zeal against the Mosaic record. The case demanded investigation. The God of creation is the God of the Bible. So Christians believe. There must not, cannot be, any real conflict between science and revelation.

The Church carried the war into the enemy's land. She sent forth her men of science to survey the field. Geology opened her doors and freely let them in. What they saw was

truly wonderful. From the peculiar formations of many of the rocks, from their relative age, as clearly indicated by the position they occupy, from the circumstances under which they were formed as clearly demanding more time than six thousand years, together with the innumerable fossils of extinct animals and vegetables deposited far below the period containing the remains of man, they saw at once that they were borne back over ages far anterior to the biblical account of the creation of man.

Can it be that the Church has given a wrong interpretation to the first sentence in the Bible? So it seems. Then a new one will have to be sought; not on purpose that harmony may be secured between science and revelation, but simply to know what the mind of the Spirit is. Interpretations have been various. One is, that the six days of creation were not natural days of twenty-four hours each, but that they represented long geological periods, perhaps of millions of years. Another, that they were natural days of twenty-four hours each, but that this first sentence contains an independent declaration of an event which took place at an undefined period before the six days' work began. This, it is believed, gives ample time for the production of all the facts revealed in the science of geology. There is still a third interpretation, which regards the first sentence as independent, and also the six days as denoting great geological periods, during which the formations of the earth's crust as they now exist were successively raised into order. It would certainly be difficult for the skeptic to prove that either the one or the other of these theories is not true. Then, since there are so many ways by which the alleged difficulties can be removed, the Church may calmly dismiss all her fears upon the subject.

In the creation of all things out of nothing, it is not to be supposed that they assumed a perfect form at once. This is not according to the analogy of nature. Progressive development is the law of the universe. The germ of the stately oak is found in the undeveloped acorn. Newton among the stars is the same as Newton in his mother's arms. The full-grown saint was once a babe in Christ. The angel that appeared to John in glory was once a lost sinner, then a

redeemed spirit of earth. Such are the ways of God. So this beautiful planet, as we now behold it in all its richness and glory, was once a crude, shapeless mass of unformed matter. Of the truth of this there can be no reasonable doubt. Geology directs our minds to some six or eight great geological periods. These are distinctly marked by the strata of the earth. They are on an ascending scale, always rising from a lower grade to a higher. These different earth-formations are stated as follows: The lowest and most ancient is the Cambrian, then the Silurian; next in order the Old Red Sandstone, Mountain Limestone, Carboniferous, Oolite, Wealden, Chalk, Eocene, Miocene, Pliocene; and last of all, the Tertiary or Man-period. Some of the above are secondary formations. Corresponding to these, and also in an ascending scale as it regards perfection of organization, are found the fossil remains of animals and plants. Those found in the lower beds are all extinct—a few in the higher yet remain. Beginning at the bottom and ascending, we find those first which are but one remove from unorganized matter: animals which have no distinct nervous system, animalcules with many stomachs, intestinal worms and parasites. These are all marine animals, showing that the rocks in which they are found were formed under water.

In the next rank we find a higher species of worms, parasites, wheel-animalcules, crabs, and the lowest forms of fishes. These are also submarine. We now approach the mollusca or soft-shell animals. Of these there is a great variety. Some have heads, others haven one. Some shells are univalve, while others are bivalve. To this family belong the snails, clams, oysters, etc. Some of these have no distinct organs of sense except eyes, and, in some, eyes are wanting. Still rising, we come to that species called *articulata*. These have a jointed or articulated covering, consisting of a series of rings, corresponding to the internal skeleton of the vertebrated animals. Here, too, we find a great variety. Some have white blood, some red; some are terrestrial, some aquatic, others amphibious. Some have twenty-four legs, others fourteen, ten, eight, six, or none. To this family belong leeches, earth-worms, crabs, lobsters, scorpions, spiders, flies, beetles, and many others.

Still approaching the man-period, we reach the better-organized family of vertebrate animals. Here we find those which suckle their young, breathe through lungs, have gills, or wings; some have cold blood, others warm; some live on the earth, some in the air, others in water. The principal of these are fishes, reptiles, and birds. Above all these, and evidently of more recent date, is the extensive family of quadrupeds. And above, and last of all, man. Without stopping to particularize, I simply remark that the same order from lower to higher life is observed in the vegetable kingdom.

At the close of each of these great geological periods, and in order to a higher state, there were no doubt great changes in the earth's matter. At one period one part of the earth's surface was submerged and then another, as is evident from the nature of the various formations themselves, as also from the character of the fossils, both of animals and vegetables, peculiar to certain strata. This could only result from great, and perhaps sudden, elevations and depressions of the earth's surface. These changes were doubtless brought about by the igneous forces operating in the heart of our planet. One of these convulsions after another took place along the line, it may be, of millions of ages up to the man-period. Immediately preceding this period, it is clear, from the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis, the earth passed through one of those tremendous paroxysms, out of which it emerged to assume pretty much its present form. For six thousand years it has been comparatively at rest. A partial convulsion, causing the flood, occasional discharges from the fiery artillery of the interior, producing temporary earthquakes, showing us that the great forces of nature are not exhausted, but only held in check for future service.

These, together with the more quiet changes, are all that belong to the man-period. This period of rest is simply one of many. There had been long, long periods like this before. The present stage of the world's progress is doubtless a great advance on the preceding, but the grand and glorious climax is yet in the unknown depths of the future. At least one more convulsion and subsequent regeneration awaits the earth. Concerning this, we have a direct revelation in the Bible, as

given by Peter and John. "But the heavens and the earth," says Peter, "which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." "And I saw," says John, "a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new."

The facts are these:

1. The present form of the earth will pass away.
2. The efficient and direct agent effecting this change is God.
3. The means employed will be fire.
4. In the regenerated world there will be no more sea, showing a great physical change in the earth's surface, and in the chemical combinations of the elemental gases.
5. The change will be sudden, even as a thief in the night.
6. All the wicked shall be separated and punished.
7. The new world will be peopled, either with man in a purified and greatly exalted state, or else by a new creation of beings, on a scale still more grand and glorious—most likely the former.

These revelations throw their light back on the facts above stated, in regard to the convulsions, and consequent advance to a higher stage in the past history of the world. Therefore, with the light which they afford, let us return and note the changes which occurred in the world, as described in the first chapter of Genesis. We have said that the first verse states an independent fact, dating back to the very beginning of the earth-matter itself. We have seen that there were many long periods, each having terminated by a great world-convulsion, but always leaving the world higher on the scale toward the man-period. This chapter describes the last of these paroxysms, together with many new creative acts of the Omnipotent Word.

"And the earth was without form and void, and darkness

was upon the face of the deep." This describes the face of the world immediately preceding the Adamic creation. "Without form and void," that is, formless and empty. Septuagint: "Invisible and incomposed." Chaldee: "Desert and empty." Bush: "Dreariness and desolation." The ground idea is the same. The earth had doubtless passed through many such states before. How long it had been in this desolate condition, we have no means of knowing. "And darkness was upon the face of the deep." Was it because there was no sun to enlighten the earth? Surely not. Animals and vegetables had flourished in great numbers and profusion long ages before this. These called for the light and heat of the sun then as now. The present darkness must have resulted from some opaque intervening object. What could that have been? It is a well-known fact that during the eruption of volcanoes the smoke and ashes rise up in such dense clouds to heaven as to obscure entirely the light of the sun for a time. If this effect follows the eruption from a single crater, what would not a world in eruption produce? Through the internal fiery forces, much, at least, of the dry land would become suddenly submerged, thereby bringing the two antagonistic and powerful elements of fire and water into dreadful collision. This would bring about a general boiling agitation all through and among the broken fragments of the earth's crust. Above this world of mingled fire and water would ascend dark clouds of smoke, sufficiently dense to shut out the last solar ray.

In this general convulsion during the period under consideration, we may reasonably suppose that most of the previously existing animals and vegetables were destroyed. All this was to prepare the world for the abode of man, who was yet to be created. "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the deep"—brooded over the bosom of the watery, agitated world. Here is the reforming agent that is to bring order out of confusion. It is an agent equal to the work. It seems fit that the same Almighty Spirit that restores order in the disorganized moral world should also bring order and beauty out of a chaotic physical world. "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." This is the beginning of

the first day's work. It is the letting in of light upon the dark world. I will not pause to consider the question whether the six days during which God restored order to the world, and with it created vegetables and animals, were common days of twenty-four hours, or great geological epochs. I will simply state that I incline to the belief that they were natural days, measured by the revolution of the earth on its axis then as now. Of the philosophy of this Moses says nothing, and perhaps knew nothing. He presented facts, not theories. But whence came the light? Was it just then created? Had no sun ever shone on the earth before? Undoubtedly there had, and perhaps millions of years, and even then was shining above the dark chaos as brightly as ever before or since. What, then, is necessary to let in his rays again? Simply the removal of the obscuring clouds of intervening smoke and ashes. That is all. This could be done by the Omnific Word at once, or by the gradual action of the sun upon the clouds of mist, while the heavier particles of ashes, cinder, etc., would be settling upon the earth. And this being a period of divine power, most likely the ordinary laws of nature were aided by a direct exertion of Omnipotence. The obscuring clouds, however, were not sufficiently removed just now to reveal the body of the sun. This did not appear until the fourth day. It was not, therefore, a day of cloudless brightness, but a dark, heavy, sunless day. The light was divided from the darkness then as now, by the diurnal revolution of the earth. "And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night." Just as we call them now. "And the evening and the morning were the first day." So the Jews say yet. As the darkness was first, so it was first named, and both together probably constituted a period of twenty-four hours. So they do yet. This was the work of the first day.

"And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." Firmament means expansion. We are not to suppose that it means the regions of the stars, but simply of the atmosphere hanging about the earth, and extending upward to the distance of many miles. On a clear day this firmament has the

appearance of a solid concave vault, and at night, to the naked eye, the stars seem to be placed in grand irregularity upon this surface. The ancients so understood the case. This, however, is a delusion which science has dispelled. On a dark, sunless day, the firmament or heavens seem to be arched with thick, dense clouds. There is an immense amount of water taken up by the heat of the sun, and held in a state of vapor and cloud in this heavenly firmament. On a clear day, this water is so perfectly evaporated as to be invisible. On a dark day, condensation has covered the heavens with dense, heavy clouds. The second day's work was to arch the heavens with such clouds, admitting much light, but not allowing the face of the sun to appear. And, indeed, if it had appeared, there was no eye to behold it. It was still a tenantless, watery world—a world in ruins.

On the third day, at the voice of God, the waters were collected into one place, and the dry land appeared. In order to this, either that portion of the earth's surface now covered with water must have been depressed, or that portion now above water raised, or else the action was in both directions, one portion sinking while the other was rising. As this shifting of the relative level of the earth's surface was going on, the waters, in obedience to well-known laws of nature, would rush forward to occupy the lowest beds, leaving the more elevated portions above the level, forming the dry land, plains, hills, and mountains. No doubt the instruments of this change were the igneous forces at work in the interior of the earth. Also upon this day the dry land was suddenly covered with "grass," and "herb," and "tree," we suppose in mature development. Thus ends the work of the third day. There is now much light in the world; there is a cloud-firmament arching the heavens, such as has been seen ten thousand times since; there is the great and mighty sea, and here the dry land covered with every variety of grass, shrub, and tree. But as yet the waters are stirred by no fish, the elastic air fanned by the wing of no bird, and the solid earth trodden by the foot of no living animal. It is a world in repose.

God speaks again. The sun, moon, and stars appear. Certainly not that they were just then called into existence.

Astronomers speak to us of stars so deeply distant in space that the light by which we see them must have been on the way even ages before man was created. These, at least, must have existed previously to the fourth day's work. It is our privilege to believe that all these heavenly bodies had been shining in all their present splendor uncounted ages before the man-period of our little world. What, then, was the special work of the fourth day? Simply the removing of the intervening clouds of heaven. That is all. Then the sun, moon, and stars appear—appear in splendor as if just then created. On the morning, or latter part of the fifth day, the sun arose in his full splendor, the moon walked the heavens on the previous night (which night was caused by the shade of the earth), and the stars looked down and smiled as they saw the molding hand of God bringing a confused world to order and life. Henceforth the sun, as he had been doing for ages, will divide the day from the night, and he, with all the heavenly hosts, will serve man for signs and seasons, and days and years. Thus the fourth day's work was ended. Now the darkness was gone, the roaring waters quiet, the firmament no longer a sheet of cloud, but a shining azure vault; the earth, clothed with verdure, stands ready for the introduction of a higher order of life.

God speaks again. The waters teem with living creatures, the air is filled with birds of every wing. Great whales stir the seas to their depths, thousands of the smaller tribes are sporting on every shoal, and the clear blue air is filled with a thousand warbling notes of joyous praise to God. But still there is not a living animal to tread the earth. During the first part of the sixth day God said, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind." The elephant, full-grown, now walks the plain; the lordly lion roams through his native forest, while thousands of the smaller species of animals instinctively find their appropriate sphere and work. Even those now domesticated—the horse, the ox, the dog, etc., and the domestic fowls—are here in abundance. What does all this mean? The earth has never been so far advanced before. It had been filled with vegetation, but of a different

kind from that now growing. The water and air had teemed with reptile and bird, but not such as are here now. The earth-fields had been occupied with a great variety of animals of strange appearance and ponderous weight, but unlike many we now behold. To stop even here, the world has made progress. But evidently the ultimate end of all this has not been reached. This earth itself, its seas and dry lands, its mountains, extended plains, and majestic rivers, its fish, and birds, and animals, all seem to point upward and onward to a still higher and more glorious existence. All these evidently exist not so much on their own account, but on account of something higher and nobler. In all this scene of beauty and life there is not a being to think of God who made the world and filled it with such richness—to love and worship Him from whom all life and being flow.

Just here we feel the pressure of a solemn pause. A mighty thought stirs the heart of God. It is the eternal Godhead—the Trinity in council. "Let us make man." The purpose was the deed. The result was full-grown man, with lovely woman by his side. It was an advance across a deep and wide gulf which separates the intelligent man from the noblest of all the irrational animal kingdom. The gap is exceedingly wide between the vegetable and the animal, but wider still between the mere animal and man. The whole of the vegetable and animal kingdoms will soon pass away and be no more, but man will live forever. To the development of the physical powers there is a brief limit, beyond which they cannot pass, but to that of the intellectual and moral powers of man there is no limit. Their scope claims the wide fields of immensity, and their birthright are the ages of eternity. The vegetable and animal kingdoms are subordinate to the will and uses of man, and have their very being in view of this end. In a word, man is lord of creation, and subordinate to the sovereign will of God alone. "In the image of God created he him." What honor in these words! What dignity! What inconceivable glory! Their depths of meaning, who can fathom? Their heights of progressive development, who can scale? In intelligence, not equal, but like God, and in moral purity like God. In these two are the vast fields of a

glory that will enrich the history of eternity. "Let him have dominion." All earthly beings and things were laid at his feet. All the animal tribes instinctively do him homage. But for sin, this submission would have remained complete. It was thus that an unorganized world was brought into a state of order and beauty. The workman was pleased with his work, and pronounced it very good.

In the work of creation, we have a wonderful display of the power of God. As we contemplate it we are led out into a field where reason cannot go—the field of faith. "By faith we understand the worlds were made." We can understand how present material can be molded into new and varied shapes; but how to begin the work of new creation, we can form no conception. No created being can call into existence that which had no existence, even the least atom. To do this is as much beyond the power of man as to create a world or a universe. He who can make an atom can make a world or a system of worlds. The thought bewilders us. The discoveries of modern science give no relief to the mind in this respect. As we think of the power of God in creation, we have to advance from an atom to a world, from a world to a system, from a system to a whole universe composed of countless systems and worlds, whose numbers approach infinity; we have to think of their measureless distances, of their overwhelming magnitudes, and of their amazing motions and velocities. Then, above and beyond all, we are forced to think of that Being who has called out of absolute and infinite nothingness into existence and life all these things, and who sits above all, pervades all, and moves all. Here the mind is overpowered. In the work of creation we see also marks of infinite wisdom. Wisdom is concerned in adapting means to ends. Doubtless this is one sense in which it was declared that all things were "very good." In the work of creation, God had an end to accomplish. The universe of both mind and matter was simply a means looking to that end. "By him and for him," expresses both the agent and the end. Creation complete was hung out as a grand and glorious display of the perfections of God. Wisdom primordially adapted all things to this end, and, so far as reason can go, declares

the means were perfect and the end glorious. The order that reigns through every part of material creation evinces the perfection of the wisdom that planned the scheme. Change there is to a limited extent, but always from a less to a more perfect development. Progression there is, but always from a lower to a higher grade of being. Confusion there is, as in the chaotic state of the earth just before the man-period, but it is confusion which contains the germ of a glorious and harmonious transformation. When being in one state ceases, it is because it has answered the end of being in that state, and that opportunity may be given for being in a more elevated state, as in the death and resurrection of the human body, or in the destruction and renovation of a world, a system, or, it may be, of the whole universe. Is there no wisdom in all this? Look, too, at the "harmony of the spheres." With what inconceivable velocity they move in every possible direction, until, to man's weak conception, the fields of measureless space become a wilderness of flying worlds! Yet with what order they move, and with what certainty do they all keep their respective places! In this shine forth the power, wisdom, and immutability of God.

The universe is the offspring of Infinite Goodness, guided by Infinite Wisdom, and executed by Infinite Power. The earth was a store-house furnished, along the ages, by the hand of Goodness, as in expectation of all the future wants of the coming man. The inexhaustible coal-fields, which supply our grates and move the machinery of the world, were prepared ages before the man-period of our planet. The same is true of the gold, iron, and other metals, as also of the various gases in the atmosphere, the lime in the earth, etc., making the world, as it were, a hot-bed of vegetative life, that the wants of man might be supplied. Do we not see goodness in every solar ray, in all the compounds of air, and earth, and water, through the mutual operation of which the world itself has become a vast machine, with its thousand wheels, all in rapid but harmonious motion, for the purpose of supplying the daily and hourly wants of man? See, too, the power of steam and of electricity, through whose agencies the most distant lands are now connected, and the millions

of our race reduced to one great family! How great is God! How far-reaching his plans! What infinite ages are demanded for the completion of his purposes! But the field is boundless. We stop, wonder, and adore.

ART. VII.—*Christian Philosophy.*

NATURE's philosophy may lead us to real and conscious truths. Moral philosophy may enable us to recognize our obligations and duties to our fellow-man and to God. But, by process of Christian reasoning alone, we can and must accept as true the unseen, unrealized, and inexplicable things promised in God's revelation. "We walk by *faith*, not by *sight*." The great conflict that has been, and is going on, between the Christian and infidel, is founded upon the false premise that all truth must be susceptible of proof before it is received. In natural or moral philosophy this may do, but not so in religion—*philosophy of faith*. The first step in a Christian life lies beyond where the means of natural and revealed religion end. It would, indeed, be a humiliating compromise with infidelity to meet the willful caviler on the ground of reason, or common ethics, alone. We must, and do, accept the Bible as God's own inspired word. It is true and peculiar; and, on the hypothesis of ordinary logic, no more unreasonable or mysterious than nature, yet the scientist or naturalist will pompously declaim on nature's God, and the "eternal fitness of things." It is no more unreasonable that a written and inspired revelation should be made, than that God should speak through nature. The former is the sequel to the latter. The one (nature) teaches the power, wisdom, and goodness; the other (revelation) teaches these, and also the great love, justice, and mercy of God.

By a parity of reasoning with the naturalist, we prove the *necessity*, much more the reasonableness, of a divine written revelation. Sin is in the world. All men are not happy; in an absolute sense, none are so. The naturalist proclaims

the goodness of God. There is a wrong somewhere. That goodness, to comport with all other exhibitions in nature, would seek the constant and unmixed happiness of all. So it does; but not in nature is it so clearly and satisfactorily demonstrated as by the written word. Nature gives no reason for this general unhappiness and universal dissatisfaction, nor does it point out a remedy. No advocate of the theory of nature's sufficiency as a guide to man's present and future ultimate happiness, will essay to argue that a strict compliance with its laws (if such were practicable), would lead men to a happy riddance of all the common ills of life—the most terrifying and dreadful of which is death. With any who may thus argue, we have neither time nor inclination to discuss the points at issue here.

That God, who manifests such unmistakable regard for the happiness of his creatures in his works of creation and providence, would most assuredly reveal to us the true cause of our failure to enjoy happiness, and also the remedy, is a logical sequence of natural, moral, and Christian philosophy. God makes the revelation. The Bible is the exponent, and the only exponent of the disease and the remedy—the cause of our suffering and the means of avoiding its final and fatal effects. Accepting the Bible as true—"the only infallible word of God"—we also accept as true all it teaches, however mysterious. Herein, then, is the state of man, as a lost and ruined race, fully and plainly declared. The way of life is also as clearly revealed. We must, and do, accept the offered Mediator as our Saviour. The great difference between the Christian and the infidel begins where the one receives the truth as it is in revelation, and the other rejects it because it is not found in nature. The process of reaching this point of separation is the same with both. They both take nature and reason as guides, as far as they lead with safety; but where these fail, at the threshold of divine, written revelation, the Christian advances, while the infidel turns back. The process of advancement with the Christian in the divine life afterward is similar to that before, he having taken, however, an additional guide. His course is onward and upward, getting brighter and brighter unto the perfect day; while that of the

infidel is around and around in a circle, confined to a routine of natural laws, assisted by the ever-varying and feeble light of reason, "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." (2 Tim. iii. 7.) "Thy word is truth." "I am the way, the truth, and the life." (John xiv. 6.)

The Christian life starts with the hearty reception of, and concurrence in, the great yet most mysterious truth—the union of the divine and human nature of Christ. Every Christian comes to the crisis in his life when he must either believe or reject the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. In the reception of this great fundamental truth in all Christian orthodoxy, he is aided by nature, reason, and revelation. These form the basis of faith, but not its consummation. Faith is a sublimation of these. There is no faith without them, but these alone cannot accomplish any part of faith's mission. "Without faith it is impossible to please Him." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Faith is an absolute prerequisite to Christian life. Faith is the guide of the Christian philosopher; with it he enters, explores, and views the beauties and utilities revealed in the word of God, but which are ever concealed from the book of nature, and far too sublime for the reach of human reason. Faith is the Christian's eye. It becomes to him more penetrating and far-reaching than any instrument used in its conception or cultivation. Faith is an effort of the heart made in a strength divinely imparted. It acts not, however, without means. These are abundantly furnished to hand. They are numerous; and often commonplace. We mention a few: Besides those already adverted to—reason and nature, the boasted weapons of infidelity against Christianity—we have the word of God, the ordinary means of grace used in the Church, communion with God, and the Holy Spirit.

Faith reaches out and beyond mere means; but it cannot reach its ultimate objects without the assistance of these. The telescope reveals what the naked eye cannot see; but it cannot act without the eye any more than the eye can see the distant object without the aid of the telescope. The eye sees the distant star, but the telescope assists only. Neither the eye nor the instrument reaches to the object seen; yet, by

the keen and susceptible vision of the one, aided by the magnifying power of the other, the object is beheld from a great distance; and, although it may not, owing to obstructions in the way, be minutely examined and discerned in all of its parts, it is still recognized, in outline, as one of the heavenly bodies. The vision of the eye, in its penetrating and extending power, peculiar to itself alone, goes far beyond the instrument, and rests its searching gaze upon the distant object. So faith, starting out upon reason's hypothesis, readily accepting its proffered aid as a channel by which to get the proper direction, moves on in straight line through all means of assistance to where they must and do end; and then, with self-adjusting, but divinely-directed, power, it leaps over the vast space beyond all means, and, with its own eye, views and lays hold upon the Eternal Son—the Saviour of the world.

All reason and revelation, with their subordinate means of grace, are but way-marks directing us heavenward. These do not extend to the true goal. In the economy of grace there is no ladder reaching from earth to heaven, except it be the ladder seen by Jacob in his vision or dream, the three principal rounds of which are faith, hope, and charity. Many are the ways and means by which poor, fallen, and apostate man is brought to the foot of this ladder; and, when once there, no good Samaritan is found to lift him up and place his feet upon the first round, and thus start him on the highway to heaven. Yet, encouraged by past experience as to God's goodness, and having power and freedom to advance—"for man's extremity is God's opportunity"—he, in his desperate situation, consents to be saved; that is, he believes unto righteousness, and God takes him up. His feet are now on the first round. The first efficacious exercise of a Christian's life is that of faith.

As the astronomer enters his observatory, and with a well-poised telescope views the different heavenly bodies by properly adjusting the instrument, so as to bring them before his eye, so the Christian philosopher enters the arena of God's dispensation of grace, and, properly adjusting his eye of faith, he makes new and ever-varying discoveries of his goodness and quickening love. "For by grace are ye saved, through

faith." (Eph. ii. 8.) Faith is strikingly symbolized as the channel, or medium, through which the Christian is supplied with all needed grace unto salvation. How strong and constant it should be! Strong, to receive the greatest good; and constant, to receive at all times, because he is ever needy. "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving." (Col. ii. 6, 7.)

Christians should use their faith in all after life as a guide to new attainments, as at first, to enter the field of spiritual philosophy. They should use it also as a weapon of offense and defense. It is termed the shield of faith. It may be used, then, as an instrument. With it, also, the Christian makes experiments. As the philosopher enters his studio, and the chemist his laboratory, to make new proofs of nature's laws, and test the composition of compounds, so the Christian enters the sanctum of spirituality and makes proof of God's love in every opening providence, and reads in the sum of intricate and varied duties the relative worth of each. Like Sir Isaac Newton, whose basis of wise and accurate philosophic result was the simple falling of an apple, the true Christian philosopher sees the hand of God in small as well as great events of life, and out of these, although sometimes mysterious and afflicting, as well as common and great, he will derive manifold blessings by proper consideration. That which can be seen and understood he receives and applies; that which cannot be realized now; he fully believes will, in due time, be made known. He, therefore, by an application of his touchstone of faith, finds "good in every thing." He is now in the broad field of Christian philosophy, and, with ample means at hand to make researches, and with ever-increasing delight, he cannot afford to turn back. His course is onward and upward. Having entered this domain as the field of his choice, he has double the advantage of profane philosophers. All the applications of worldly science may be turned to advantage here, without doing violence to his high calling. In addition to these, he has the advantages of godly experience. How sure must be his success!

Natural science carries us far enough into the field of observation to convince every willing student that every cause and effect must work agreeably to fixed and safe laws. There is no conflict in nature. Man only makes mistakes. Every apparently untoward circumstance is the result of man's error, developed by irrevocable laws of nature's God. So far as the student of nature has traveled intelligently in the highway of science, every mystery has been so fully explained, and every seeming contradiction so reasonably accounted for, that he reconciles all else in the great future to rules and regulations as efficacious as those that have guided him in the past. "There is no cause without an effect," and there is no effect without an adequate cause. Upon this hypothesis the scientist bases his future knowledge. As in nature, so in morals; as in morals, so in spiritual things. God is the wise author and correct designer of all codes—natural, moral, and spiritual.

From these premises let us draw a lesson, and apply it to the Christian. As soon as a man enters the school of Christ, becomes religious, he becomes a moral and spiritual philosopher—he enters upon the highway of moral and spiritual science. This leads him on, and on, through the mysterious path of Christian duty, in a life of pleasant toils and sacrifices, to its crowning and glorious terminus, right in the presence of God. What a wonderful and charming route! He may regale himself by the way with foreign refreshments; he may repose for a time amid way-side issues, and try to quench his thirst from springs of worldly pleasure; but nothing short of an onward course will constantly gratify the Christian student. He is not content with what he has learned in this, any more than the natural philosopher is in his course of investigation. He applies his lessons to every-day life, and makes the most he can out of seemingly small as well as great and providential events. With God, nothing is trifling. Every thing, from the merest tiny insect to the great elephant and whale; from the single grain of sand to the towering mountain; from the single blade of grass to the mighty forest oak; and from the drop to the grand old ocean—every thing has its appropriate place and mission. The Christian may truly wonder what

his mission is in the great arena of time; yea, in the undiscovered eternity.

He again applies his rules of moral philosophy and spiritual sensibility, and reasons thus: There is no duty nor obligation too trivial to be neglected; none but what was intended for good, and will be rewarded. The Christian's reward is not so much from what he does, as from the manner and spirit of doing it. A small duty done in humble subjection to God's will, if in faith, awaiting his time and pleasure to bless, will give more joy and comfort to the Christian than an untimely and half-hearted effort at something great.

Again, the Christian philosopher applies his rules to the common losses and deep afflictions of life which fall to his lot, and, by the same process of reasoning, concludes—yea, fully believes—they are intended for the best, often for his own good. So he waits, and patiently toils on, looking for God's clearer revelation. But once more, what of his relation to the great, undiscovered future? Vastly more is required of him, in proportion to his capabilities and endowments, than of any other of God's creatures; and, in proportion to these capabilities and endowments, if faithfully improved, will be his final capacity to enjoy happiness hereafter. He learns to judge the future by the past, and, in so doing, believes "all things work together for good to them that love God." What now appears mysterious will be fully revealed. What now appears impossible will, when the proper time arrives, acknowledge the truthful scriptures, "But with God all things are possible." "Now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. Then shall I know even as also I am known." (1 Cor. xiii.) Glory to God for a progressive and ever-enlightening and inspiring Christianity! If our cup runs over here, what will it be there, when unmixed? If our limited knowledge is so elating here, what will it be there, when unobscured? We cannot answer now, but will after awhile. Who would not rather be an humble Christian philosopher, drinking constantly and more deeply from the stream of living, divine knowledge, that leadeeth on,

and on, with increasing and charming delights, to the fountain-head of all knowledge and joy, than to be clothed in purple and fine linen, and sit in kings' palaces, to enjoy only what little of good there is in this life ?

The world can never give
The bliss for which we sigh ;
'Tis not the whole of life to live,
Nor all of death to die.

ART. VIII.—*The Function of Prayer in the Economy of the Universe.*

RECENT controversy regarding the function of prayer in the economy of the universe has illustrated the almost chronic tendency of two schools of thought, and the seemingly inveterate bias which they produce. The reluctance of the religious world to admit that there is a sphere to which prayer (in the sense of petition) is inherently inapplicable, is quite as conspicuous as is the hesitation of the physicist to concede its legitimacy, and to admit its power within the spiritual domain. It is natural that those whose life-work is the investigation of physical law, and whose researches are rigorously governed by the methods of induction, should wish to prove the value of an alleged power by definite experimental tests, such as the collection of statistics, or by some process not inferior in accuracy to those on which all science rests. But it is manifestly unfair to deal thus with a power which the wisest of their opponents remove altogether from the sphere of physical causation. It is, perhaps, equally natural that those whose deepest experience records that prayer "availeth much" should shrink from narrowing the area to which its efficacy extends; and perceiving that the spiritual and physical forces are interrelated and reciprocal, should be jealous of any encroachment from the physical side. But it is as unphilosophical for the spiritualist to thrust within the province of the naturalist a power which is unchallengeable within its own sphere, as it

is for the naturalist to slight a force the *rationale* of which escapes his physical tests.

The controversy resembles that which has lasted from the dawn of speculation between the intuitionists and experientialists, in which the disciples of both schools are reluctant to concede the full value of the *data* in which the counter theory takes its rise. It is, indeed, but a subordinate phase of the same controversy; kindred, in this respect, to that which divides the advocates of evolution from those who believe in successive incursions of creative force. The success which has attended the labors of naturalists in accounting for the origin of species by "natural selection," has induced them to extend the operation of the law to the intellectual and moral nature of man, where (though it explains subordinate phenomena), in the presence of free will, it breaks down. While the discussion is exhilarating, and the whole controversy a stimulus to patient and accurate research, *collision* between the two schools is philosophically illegitimate and fruitless of result. In the one system, we see the spiritual protest of the reason and the conscience, against the domination of material law, and the paralyzing sense of necessity; but in alliance with it a frequent vagueness of statement, the airiness of mysticism, and occasionally an indifference to facts. In the other, we experience the healthful recoil of the scientific mind against all rash ontology, and alleged but unverifiable *data*; but along with it, the frequent collapse of that spiritual instinct which leads behind the barriers of physical sequence. It is the part of a wise eclecticism to attempt a reconciliation between the opposite schools; and in the question at present brought to the front (the validity of prayer), to vindicate against the physicist its function in the economy of nature, and against the ultra-spiritualist to maintain the invariability of natural laws, and the irreverence of human entreaty for any interference with these. It is a blot upon our civilization that in the conduct of this controversy there has been so much heat and acrimony, and a lack of comprehensive fairness on either side.

No one, even slightly acquainted with scientific methods and results, can for a moment brook the idea of any interfer-

ence with the laws of external nature, produced by human prayer. We may add that (be our knowledge of science virtually *nil*) we can scarcely doubt that the amount of physical force within the universe is incapable either of increase or diminution, but only of endless modification; that the physical *nexus* between phenomena, in their ceaseless flux and reflux, is never broken; while the order in which the phenomena appear is governed by the rigor of adamantine law. The links of the chain of physical sequence continue to lengthen out interminably, connecting the past with the present, and uniting the present to the future infallibly. Catastrophe—the breaking of the chain—is simply inconceivable. And so far as we can think of the complex economy of nature as a series of prearrangements, they have been adjusted each to each with the completest mastery of all possible emergencies. Were they ever altered at the suggestion of a creature, either they were imperfect before the suggestion was made, or they were made less perfect by means of it. If previously perfect, the change would be undivine; and if not perfect until the change, we could with difficulty believe in the perfection of him who made it.

The conception of the absolute fixity of physical law is one which the progress of science has made axiomatic. Belief in an all-comprehending Intelligence, which saw “the end from the beginning,” and “determined beforehand” the history of every inorganic atom, and the evolution of each sentient structure, is a postulate of rational theology; and that in the guidance of the universe its great Superintendent acts according to laws “set up from everlasting,” is no less axiomatic. The more vehement opponents of this doctrine boldly challenge the *datum* from which it starts, viz., the invariability of material law. They say that it is an unproved, and therefore an unscientific assertion, that the sequences which seem to us invariable are so necessarily. Let us grant that the invariability is not “in the nature of things.” The calm rejoinder of the physicist is, “We have no scientific experience to warrant the belief that nature’s sequences ever *are* variable.” And mere experience taken as our guide, the solution of the question on both sides would be easy. The efficacy of prayer

to quicken and exalt, to change the character and elevate human life, is a fact of consciousness. On the other hand, we have now-a-days no instance of the suspension of physical law in answer to prayer. Alike in the physical and moral region, the causal *nexus* is inviolate. In both, it is always as a man sows that he reaps. If he injures his physical frame, he reaps the consequence in physical detriment; if he impairs his moral power and spiritual vision, he gathers the harvest of moral degeneracy. But there is no confusion of the spheres of moral and physical agency. To put it otherwise, a spiritual antecedent will not produce a physical consequent. The exercise of the religious function of prayer cannot directly effect any material change. It is the appeal of spirit to Spirit, conducted within the spiritual sphere, for purposes that are strictly supranatural.

It is in vain to reply that we are continually interfering with the seemingly fixed laws of the universe, and altering their destination by our voluntary activities or scientific appliances, for in all such cases we simply make use of existing forces. We are ourselves a part of the physical *cosmos*, and in accordance with its laws we exert a power which changes external nature. But we can never escape from the domain of law. Our act, were we to attempt it, would itself be a link in the chain of phenomenal sequence. The very moment we put it forth, as agents in a phenomenal world, that instant the energy we exert (itself determined by prior influence) enters as a new element into the vast chain of physical causation. In short, we can only change the existing order by the exercise of a power which is itself a part of that order, and whose every movement is regulated by law.

The extremely vague manner in which those who imagine that prayer can directly alter the sequences of nature state their case, is in the last degree unscientific. Thus it is said, May not God, who is sovereign and free, direct the forces of nature in one direction rather than another, in reply to the free entreaty of a creature whom he encourages to pray? and the atmospheric phenomena are supposed to be peculiarly amenable to such "direction." Suppose, then, that after a period of dry weather, prayer is offered, and rain begins to

fall, will the theologian venture to deny that there was as exact an order in the physical antecedents as there would have been had no prayer been offered? Will he hazard the assertion that there was a break in the *nexus* between the descent of the rain and the physical causes which produced it? that a spiritual agency exerted by the petitioner has become the cause of the atmospheric change (the condensation of the cloud and the descent of the rain), at a particular spot, and a special time? The crude notion seems to be widely entertained that because the changes of the weather are apparently capricious, the wind blowing "as it listeth," it may be sent forth on special errands in answer to human entreaty. Is not this the polytheistic notion of *Æolus*, with the winds in his fists? It is supposed that the destination of a physical force can be arrested, and the otherwise inevitable result prevented, by an act of divine volition. But the antecedent force *must* spend itself, and determine some consequent. It simply cannot be arrested, or lifted out of its place amongst the links of physical causation, without the whole chain falling to pieces. Its efficiency in giving rise to a new sequence *is involved in its very existence*; while the discovery of the correlation and transmutation of the forces proves that the prior agent is still present, and operative under an altered form.

But it is said that while the chain of physical sequence remains unbroken, the local *incidence* (if we may so speak) of each link may be determined by some ethereal wave of hyper-physical energy, transmitted along the entire line from its fountain-head, in delicately subtle undulations, resembling the waves of light and sound, or the flash of electricity through a telegraph wire; and that the course of this hyper-physical energy may be determined in answer to the prayers of man. This assertion has all the characteristics of a hypothesis devised to escape from the horns of a dilemma. It is not supposed to apply to the whole domain of nature; but only to a part of it; since no one would pretend that the rotation of the seasons was thus determined. Yet the fluctuations of the weather between two seconds of time are as rigorously determined by law as are the larger successions of the seasons; and to imagine that the Supreme Power would thus isolate

some physical events from the rest is inconceivable. It would introduce the most arbitrary casualism in place of the orderliness of law. Again, suppose that there be no physical "fountain-head," but an endless cycle of recurrent energy, and what becomes of the hypothesis? Farther, what purpose would this hyper-physical wave subserve that is not already and better accomplished in the ordinary causation of the universe? Again, the introduction of this casual element, overruling and deflecting some phenomena of nature (much as the free volitions of a man determine the sequences of his acts), would infallibly disturb the rest, and introduce bewildering chaos. For, though hyper-physical in its origin and character, the effect it is said to produce is not hyper-physical (in that case we should have no controversy with its advocates), but physical, and it is believed to give rise to an interminable series of fresh physical results. That it should be in the power of any creature thus to launch a new agency almost at will into the prearranged system of nature, and thereby to begin a series of changes which are absolutely interminable in their effect, is simply incredible. Lastly, we have no experimental evidence of this subtle wave of influence, or of its results, from which we might infer a cause. It is an unverified hypothesis at the best.

Setting it aside, therefore, we are forced to the conclusion that human prayer has no validity as a force directly working within the domain of physical nature. To pray for fine weather, or for rain (except as an humble expression of man's dependence upon forces that are vaster than he and on Him from whom they emanate), is quite as illegitimate as it is to pray against the approach of winter, the return of summer, or even against to-morrow's sunrise. If the rain we ask for is needful for our particular district in the ultimate and general economy of nature, it will fall in due course. If it does not do so, it is simply because it, or its physical equivalents, have been required elsewhere in the balance of that supreme economy. To desire its local cessation when it seems excessive, or its local presence when there is a drought, is the mere impulse of human selfishness, anxious to possess the most desirable things in one's immediate neighborhood (and

ignorant of what these really are), forgetting that the Administrator of the Universe has to consider the greatest good of the whole number; that he is superintending the whole economy of nature, in which the apparent bane of one district is the blessing of another, while *he* is devoid of favoritism; and that these terms, "bane" and "blessing," have really *no meaning* to the physical universe at large.

But we are repeatedly told by theologians that an answer to prayer within the physical realm is a sign of the Divine Presence, helpful to the suppliant's faith. Is this a worthy conception of God's relation to the universe, that he every now and then interferes with his established order to prove his own supremacy? that he interrupts the working of his machine to prove that he is *there* behind it, and has *power* to alter nature, or to grant the requests of his creatures? Is not such a notion the offspring of the very rudest anthropomorphism? It is difficult to imagine a poorer idea of divine revelation than is implied in such arbitrariness. To those who think it gracious condescension, it may be replied that it would be quite as significant of caprice. It is supposed that having created a tiny creature, and brought him into the midst of the universal order (a creature that scarcely ever comprehends the meaning of that order), the Supreme Artificer finds it expedient continually to announce himself by an alteration of the course and destination of phenomena at the unenlightened (it may be selfish) call of that creature, and that he does so while at the same time his presence is ceaselessly revealed within every pulse and movement of the universe. But the very purport of revelation (which is merely the withdrawing of a veil) is not to show the creature that primeval order *can* be violated, or that "the material is subordinate to the spiritual." It is to announce the fact that the spiritual lies abidingly *within* the material, as its underlying essence. And while this is the philosophical notion, is it not also the biblical idea of the relation which God sustains to the *cosmos*? We have no evidence that the writers of our sacred books regarded the power, which manifested itself to them in unusual ways, as different from that of which we see a daily apocalypse in the material world. So far from this,

these writers uniformly speak of all natural phenomena as the direct outcome of divine agency. God "walks on the wings of the winds;" the clouds are "his chariot;" "his voice" is heard when it thundereth, and so forth. To the Hebrew prophets and psalmists, at least, the supernatural was the power which works *through* the natural order, of which all the forces of the universe are manifestations to men.

But there is a farther question to which the physicist may validly demand an answer. All men instinctively abstain from presuming to ask God for certain things within the physical sphere—for example, for constant daylight, for perpetual summer, for physical immortality, or for the resurrection of the dead. The physicist asks us *why* do we abstain from such requests, but because we find that they are contrary to the laws of nature, that their occurrence would involve the absolute overthrow of the existing cosmical order? And he is equally entitled to press for an answer to the question, Why should we draw a line, and exclude *any* physical phenomena whatsoever from the category of the fixed and predetermined? By degrees we learn to include all that seems at first anomalous within the majestic sweep of predetermined law. And is it not in exact proportion to our ignorance of what is fixed that we make it the subject of our petitions? Religious men do not pray for eternal sunshine or for physical immortality. Why? Simply because they recognize that such would be *contrary to the will of God, as revealed in the laws of external nature*, and it rests with them to prove that one single physical event may validly be excluded from the list of the predetermined, before they call on us to pray with reference to it. We are bound to reply to this appeal of the naturalist.

Meanwhile there is another objection that is fatal to this habit of prayer for things that are purely physical. It distorts the petitioner's idea of the moral character of God, leading him almost invariably to imagine that special catastrophes are signs of displeasure, calling for confession of sin and repentance. A season of unusual cold and rain, resulting in a bad harvest and threatened famine, or a winter of prolonged storm, strewing our shores with wrecked vessels and wasted cargoes, or a time of cattle-plague, or an outbreak of chol-

era—these are regarded as marks of the general displeasure of Heaven, calling for general confession of sin, and prayer for the lessening or removal of such disaster. Men do this, and yet call their ancestors irrational because they prayed against eclipses, and the mediæval warriors foolish because they feared a catastrophe on the earth when the auroral light was colored in the sky. In both cases it is to cower with craven hearts as before a capricious deity. The habit of mind it induces is disastrous to piety and even to sincerity, and there is often mere arbitrariness as well as spiritual unreality in the appointment of humiliation-days for bad harvests or the presence of a plague. It would be more rational to appoint a fixed hour for humiliation, to last the whole year round, for the thousand human miseries that are more acute and terrible than loss of crops, or death of cattle, or winter wrecks, or the incursions of pestilence can ever be. Even the most ignorant of those, who observe such days, do not regard the calamitous events as judgments for special sins. The divine words touching the tower of Siloam have dissipated that idea, at least for Christendom. But it is judged expedient when disaster overtakes a nation or a community to make some confession of sin in general, and in conjunction with it to pray for the removal of the calamity. Now so far as it can be obviated or lessened by human action, prudence, foresight, and conformity to the laws of nature, man may validly pray to be enabled to put forth that foresight and sagacity, and to conform to these laws. But in so far as the disaster is due to causes with which he cannot interfere, it is illegitimate in him to pray for their removal. His obvious duty then is to acquiesce in the will of the Supreme. If he prays, as he should, it must be simply for the spirit of submission. Even in the former case it is only indirectly that he may pray for the removal of a pestilence. He may ask for wisdom to cope with it, for a knowledge of the laws of health, and for ability to conform to these, inasmuch as unconscious aid is often vouchsafed to the will of the agent who is striving to observe them. Doubtless this is often involved in petitions for the removal of existing evil. But it is as commonly ignored in the selfish longing for some "special providence" which may

sweep the pestilence away. But there is superficiality as well as irreverence in the easily uttered cry for deliverance, which frequently dulls the edge of practical endeavor to remove the evil and conform to the neglected law, expressive of the divine will. There is irreverence in it, implying a distrust of the absoluteness of the divine wisdom and love; and it is altogether irrational, if offered up in opposition to the clear evidence of experience that it is fruitless, and that God does not thus gratify wishes which may be the mere caprice of his creatures. Doubtless the undertone of all devout prayer is, "Not my will, but thine be done;" that is to say, the petitioner confesses his ignorance of what ought to be, and rejoices in the surrender of his wishes. But in addition to this acknowledged undertone, if God reveals the fact that his will is done, *through the laws he has established*, is it not supreme irreverence in man, craving for a "sign and a wonder," to cry out for something more? It is blasphemous to imagine that God ever violates a law. The only violation of law of which we can form any conception is its *non-observance* by an agent who can and should obey it; and in reference to that he may always pray for strength patiently to conform to the Eternal Order.

Conceding all this (and that not reluctantly), because it is in conformity with the dictates of reason, and also with "the sweet reasonableness" of Christianity, we must also vindicate against those who impugn it, the function and the no less "sweet reasonableness" of prayer, as a spiritual fact within the economy of nature. It is unfortunate that our modern physicists do not begin their inquiry into the *rationale* of prayer by testing its value within the spiritual domain. They might disarm hostility to the doctrine they teach touching physical nature, were they to recognize in *spiritual* prayer, not a mere "potent supplement" to the religious life, but the very pulse of that life itself. Now it is incorrect to say that prayer is ever regarded by its advocates as "a form of physical energy." Unless as a loose figure of speech, that is simply a travesty of what is held by all rational theologians. Prayer is always believed (even by the most illiterate) to be a spiritual power, the exercise of which determines the acts of the Spirit-

ual Power above, which in its turn accomplishes a change amongst phenomena. This may be erroneous, and it is for the naturalist to combat it, if he is scientifically able to do so. But our physicists say that they "cannot express their repugnance at the notion that Supreme Intelligence and Wisdom can be influenced by the suggestions of any human mind, however great." Is not this totally to deny the validity of prayer, by an absolute assertion to the contrary? We are informed that modern science contends only for "the displacement" of prayer, not for its "extinction." But when we ask, What is the value attached to it within its own domain? we receive this very vague reply, "That in some form or other, not yet evident, prayer may, as alleged, be necessary to man's highest culture." It is a peradventure at the best. It may be of use, and that only as a means toward "man's highest culture," and that in a way "not yet evident." Do the accumulated experiences of ages then go for nothing on these two points—that the prayer of the righteous "availeth much," that it is the opening of a window to the Supernatural, and that, while a devout man prays, his spirit is touched from above to finest spiritual issues? Have all religious men who have prayed for inward light, quickening, and help, and believed that they were listened to, no claim to be heard as witnesses in favor of a fact which is dim to the scientific eye? We maintain that the true sphere and function of prayer are purely spiritual (though in one important respect the *results* of prayer tend out beyond that region), and that it is in the spiritual freedom of man on the one hand, and the eternal freedom of God on the other, that we find its *rationale*. The being and the moral character of God must, of course, be taken for granted in any discussion as to the function of prayer. To every theory of the universe that dispenses with His existence, or merges it in nature, prayer is manifestly an excrescence. It might still be an impressive utterance of the soul in moments of sorrow, or tragic loss, or even of triumph, like a stream chafing between the rocky barriers of its course; but it would have no rational ground, and could never be a duty. It is noteworthy, however, that the act of devotion arising out of the felt dependence of the creature, is one of the means by

which the latent sense of the Divine Presence may be quickened into life. Starting then with this postulate, the existence and recognizability of God, the *raison d'être* of prayer is almost self-evident. In a sense, it is by the avenue of prayer that we come unto God, even unto his seat. The act of devotion leads the worshiper into his presence; not as revealed in space or time, or through any representative form, but as the ever-present and eternal life. It is but the inarticulate language of the heart, the voice of the spirit, recognizing its own original. This very power of recognition, however, implies superiority to the unconscious forces of the material world. Had we no free spiritual power within us, differentiating us from surrounding existence, we could not "come into" God's presence in the act of devotion; for surely in that presence man, as well as unconscious nature, always stands. But endowed with intelligence and spiritual freedom, he may, by an act either of the will, or of simple aspiration, present his spirit to the Divine, withdrawing it from the sphere of the sensuous, and subjecting it to the influence of the super-sensible. And the Divine Nature may then act upon the human, to quicken and exalt, directly "enduing it with power from on high." In the conscious freedom of our own wills we recognize a power, irreducible by analysis, which proclaims our superiority to the links of physical causation, while it acts in unbroken harmony with these. It testifies that in our inmost essence we are not the mere products of organizing force, but that we have (to use the Kantian terms) natures *noumenally* free, and therefore noumenally related to God. The sphere of prayer is, therefore, the life of the creature endowed with moral freedom, and the capacities of spiritual growth. Its value to the individual consists in the impulse it conveys to the inmost energies of the soul in their ascent and progress. By a direct divine afflatus it tends, when it is, in Pauline phrase, "prayer with the spirit and with the understanding also," to clarify the intellect and to elevate the heart, to rectify the bias of the passions, to strengthen the conscience, and discipline the will, and to foster all the virtues. Are *these* results to be slighted because the power which effects them is inoperative in external nature? In that outer

region all is orderly and fair; but in the region of the spiritual there is conscious disorder, moral chaos, which is at once an evidence of the need and a vindication of the reasonableness of an interference with it. Since, then, it *can* be altered for the better (while physical nature cannot), and since the alteration of this internal world is accomplished by the efforts of a man's free will, while God works in it—and is impossible in its highest phases, without help and coöperation from him—why should not man petition for that help, why should he not ask for the presence of the *Coöperator*? For that is absolutely all. Prayer involves petition; but it is request for nothing outward. The petition is but the expression of that hunger and thirst for the Divine Presence, of which the Hebrew psalmists write with such passionate ardors, the longing for perfection, the desire to escape from fell disorder, and conform to the order of everlasting right, with absolute submission to the will of the Eternal. Thus the act of prayer is the very key to the kingdom of God. We cannot dispense with it without discarding all worship whatsoever, all recognition of the Supreme Being, or of "the power which makes for righteousness" in the world. If religion be the recognition of, and allegiance to, the personal and ever-present God, a man cannot be religious and neglect devotion. He may be modest, reverent, humble, full of admiration, or awe-struck before the mysteries and sublimities of the universe; but religious, in the sense above defined, he cannot be.

We are told, however, by all agnostic teachers, that this is a mistake; that the essence of religion is the recognition of mystery, the essential element in prayer being a feeling of wonder and admiration in presence of resistless force, unerring wisdom, and everlasting power. As our confidence in the eternal order deepens, we are lifted to the true "Rock that is higher than we," and filial piety evidences itself by the absence of any wish for a change of that which *is*. Mute dependence on resistless force, fearing no catastrophe, believing in none, independent of all "means of grace" and seasons of devotion—that is the Alpha and Omega of piety. Surely it is the old Stoic fate with its one virtue of submission, under a roseate modern guise. To work and to wonder, that and that alone

is to pray. We are farther told that whatever be the wisdom of the petitioner, his knowledge is literally less than nothing and vanity to the Most High; and that his ignorance, breeding humility, forbids every petition. In short, the more ignorant a man is the more he will pray for, the more intelligent he is the less he will pray for, and when his intelligence is perfected he will not pray at all.

It would conduce to clearness and lessen the risks of misrepresentation were we informed whether such a sweeping condemnation as the above applies to all petitions whatsoever, or only to prayer for physical well-being, and interferences with nature. The opponents of prayer do not sufficiently recognize the fact that very few, if any, petitions are offered up in an absolute and unsubordinated manner. Even when unaccompanied by the express reservation, "Thy will be done," this is (as we have remarked) the essential undertone, or suppressed premise, in all true prayer. It is the unvarying yet most musical refrain, running through every song of devotion. And if rash suggestions touching the physical world are occasionally heard from the lips of rude though pious worshipers, we may be sure that the Hearer of prayer, "unto whom *all* flesh shall come," does not despise the stammering speech due to infancy of mind. Such stammering, however, becomes irreverence in mental manhood, and in this matter emphatically, when "we become men, we must put away childish things."

We have said that the mind, trained in the patient study of nature's processes, learns gradually to include even seeming anomalies within the sweep of predetermined law; but if trained also in reflective science, it asks, What constitutes "a law"? and discovers that it is but the expression of the way in which the forces of the universe fulfill their mission, and that is, in other words, to say by which the Eternal Mechanist and Sustainer works within his own creation. *He* is the living pulse within the whole machinery of nature, and the laws of matter or of mind are but the indices of his activity, the generalized expression or interpretation of the way in which the Supreme Artist, Builder, and Administrator controls his own creation. So far all is fixed, though it is the fixity of unerr-

ing wisdom; unalterable, simply because it is the arrangement of an Optimist Ruler. But within the mind that contemplates this unchallengeable order, there is something that is not fixed. We are conscious of moral freedom, the autocratic power of self-determination, while we are also conscious of moral disorder, and the need of rectification. The latter consciousness impels the spirit instinctively to look beyond itself for aid—that is to say, it prompts it to pray, while the former suggests the presence of One who is the source of the freedom, and is able to readjust.

It is impossible in this paper to unfold the evidence which our moral freedom bears to its own Archetype and Original. But, assuming the Divine Existence, and the resemblance between the human and the divine, the corollary is evident enough. If within the fountain-head of the Divine Nature, in which the human lives and has its being, there is a fullness of life unexhausted in the existing universe—power in reserve, yet communicable—prayer is but the approach of the human spirit to its source, that it may receive the inspiration of that power. We must admit the existence of this reserve of communicable life within the Divine Essence, unless we hold that it has exhausted itself in creation; or that the *moral* fountain-head is an exact counterpart of a *physical* spring, and that what issues from it previously entered it in an altered form; that is to say, unless we believe in the transmigration of souls, or their reabsorption in the universal life. But if an addition is made to the moral contents of the universe on the appearance of every new human life, there *must be* this reservoir of unexhausted power within the moral source. And if it exists in eternal wealth and communicable freshness (its most spiritual features suggested by the wells of earth, those “fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills”), man may surely pray for it, and may find it descend upon him, or rather rise up within him, pervading his faculties, molding his life, and replenishing his will. Intelligent recognition of the Ever-present Mind is itself an act of prayer. The expression of such power in the language of adoration or trust is secondary to the act of recognition itself. But no sooner does the soul look, as through a window (we must speak in material figures),

on the supernatural, than desire to approach the Divine Presence, and to be brought into harmony with it, instinctively arises. And that longing (of which St. Augustine has left so noble a record in his "Confession"), the *desiderium* of the heart, is most truly the essence of prayer. It is petition for the loftiest order of good, tempered with submission, and yet preacient of success.

If, now, we are told by those whose researches have confined them for a lifetime within the tracks of physical law, that with this region of "inner mysteries" they are unfamiliar, it might be a perfectly valid and strictly philosophical rejoinder that they "have faculties within which they have never used." If, recognizing the divine existence, they are not conscious of the stirrings of that instinct which prompts the prayer of the devout—of that flagging of the wing of all endeavor which evokes it in some—or that sense of loneliness which awakens the filial cry in others—they are not at liberty to treat it either as a weakness or an unproductive act, to be banished from the realm of scientific utilities. By the very conditions of the case they are precluded from pronouncing on its validity, because they cannot isolate the phenomenon in question, throw it into a crucible, and subject it to analytic tests. It is simply impossible to bring the life of the petitioner within the compass of any experimental gauge. As has been well remarked, "We cannot enter into the heart of those who pray, and take scientific precautions lest the experiment be delusive, and measure what was the moral strength *before* the prayer, and what accession of strength has come *after* it." (F. Newman.) Besides, the deepest aspirations of the soul are least discernible by those who study the process from without; and the most intense replies—accessions of spiritual power—are necessarily unperceived by those who merely watch the current in its flow, that they may compute the volume of its waters. They always reduce the worshiper to silence, and breed reserve. The soul may be kindled to unwonted glow with the inspirations of heaven, and may find that the words of a litany, or the music of a psalm, are the fittest channel in which to express itself; but the power which has reached it from above can never be subjected to scrutiny

in its origin or transit. The concession made by the physicist that prayer may "strengthen the heart to meet life's losses, and thus indirectly promote physical well-being, as the digging of Æsop's orchard brought a treasure of fertility greater than the treasure sought," needs only to be extended a little farther in the same direction to warrant all we are contending for. If along with the "wise passiveness" it breeds, helping us to bear the loss and the defeat, it becomes an active power, stirring the fires of devotion, and leading to moral victory, the immeasurable range of its influence will be conceded, and even a scientific truth discerned in that "counsel of perfection," *Ask, and ye shall receive.*

So far our position may not be challenged by any but the dogmatic materialist, or the necessitarian, or the agnostic. But we have already raised the question, Is there any thing beyond the life or subjective experience of the petitioner that may be legitimately sought in prayer? and have added that if the spiritualist maintains that there is, he is bound to define that thing, or class of things, with rigorous precision, and to show the reasonableness of his act. The character of the class in question is easily defined. It might be thought that, as the popular adage puts it, "Man's extremity is God's opportunity," the class would be that to which human efficiency does not extend. It is precisely the reverse. Whatever may be accomplished by human instrumentality within the physical domain may be a subject of petition, inasmuch as prayer may originate a movement which tends outward from the will of the agent, and indirectly accomplishes these results. This admission is in full consistence with our primary statement that the sphere of prayer is wholly spiritual; for the area within which the answer is vouchsafed is the life of the petitioner (or of those for whom he prays), where the will of the Supreme may freely move the natures underneath its touch. Thus, in asking for deliverance at a time of peril, the really devout heart will pray (though perhaps unconsciously), not for interference with existing order, but for help to enable it to conform to that order. And it may pray for the result, without alluding to the instrumentality, just as we set down a contraction, or a short-hand sign, for a full word.

To take two simple instances. We pray for a friend's life that seems endangered. Such prayer can never be an influential element in arresting the physical course of disease by one iota. But it *may* bring a fresh suggestion to the mind of a physician, or other attendant, to adopt a remedy which, by natural means, "turns the tide" of ebbing life, and determines the recovery of the patient. Or we pray for the removal of a pestilence, and the answer is given within the minds and hearts of those who take means to check it or uproot it. The latent power that lies within the free causality of man may be stimulated and put in motion from a point beyond the chain of physical sequence, and crises innumerable may be averted through human prayer, thus dislodging a spiritual force that slumbers, and sending it beneficently forth from its "hiding-place of power." Nevertheless, it will always be exceedingly unsafe to infer from the observation of results that any such dislodgment *has* taken place. For, in the first place, there will always be a larger number of petitions offered up for recovery than are ever granted; and, secondly, there will be many more coincidences between prayer and recovery that have no *causal* connection. Restoration may begin immediately after prayer, but it would be extremely rash to infer that the former was a consequence of the latter. Suppose a case in which prayer is offered, and there is no subsequent interference by man in any way, and the patient recovers, it would be sheer assumption to affirm that the prayer had caused the cure. Even were it able directly to affect the physical chain of antecedents and consequents (which it is not), it would be impossible in any single case to *know that it had done so*. As in the case of spiritual response, we cannot insulate the phenomena one from another, so as to apply an experimental test. There is manifestly no scope for the application of inductive science to an invisible agency which eludes observation; therefore we believe that answers to prayer, touching things physical, are only *possible* when effected through the agency and instrumentality of man, and even then we can never know how far they have or have not been granted. It is easy to perceive the reason of this inability, and also to see the mischievous results which would ensue

were such knowledge ours. There is another aspect in which prayer for physical results may be regarded, though no reply is ever granted. It may be a legitimate expression of our *longing for perfection*, our desire for the harmony of creation, with the abolition of all that now seems to mar its order. It is doubtless a consistent theory that, as we live in an optimist universe, there is now no real blot, or lack of harmony, within it; and that what seems imperfect is simply due to the nature of our lenses, or the limited range of the human eye, that cannot see all round the perfect sphere. It is more consistent, however, to believe that a real chaos exists, which will be but temporary; that its temporariness does not destroy its present reality, and that "the discords have rushed in" only that harmony may result. If, then, as disturbing element really exists, one who sees the meaning and is attracted toward the Universal Order, may validly desire the extinction of its opposite, and may express that longing in a prayer. This, indeed, is the very essence of the cry, "Thy kingdom come; thy will be done in earth as in heaven." It is a prayer for universal harmony. The blight and pestilence of the world are surely abnormal. They are not a part of the absolute order, are not even the outcome of law. We cannot speak of the laws of disease as we speak of the laws of health. Disease is the non-fulfillment of the conditions of health. It is anarchic and lawless. It seems reasonable, therefore, to desire the extinction of disease, and blight, with physical discord of every kind, as well as to desire the abolition of all moral evils. The gradual wearing out of an organic structure by slow decay, when it has fulfilled its function in nature, is no encroachment on physical perfection; but its removal by a sudden stroke we lament as untimely, though in both cases it is the same ending of terrestrial life. Just as the plucking of a bud is a loss different in kind from the gradual decay of the flower when its bloom is over. And our desire for the physical perfection of the whole creation might prompt the expression of that longing to its Author.

But here, again, we are on the verge of rashness, and run the risk of inexactitude. It may be that the varieties of disease are as much a part of the fixed arrangements of the

cosmos as are the different types of organization. Certainly the causes which produced them have worked for centuries, and must continue operative in the future. Their variety may have also a certain physiological beauty. It is more in keeping with the general plan of nature, that human life should terminate in a hundred ways, than that all should reach old age, and fall monotonously into the tomb. Besides, we find a system of elaborate contrivances to inflict pain, and to effect slaughter and sudden death in the animal world. The whole living system of nature, from the infusoria to the mammal, is a storehouse of illustrations of the same apparent evil, while

Nature red in tooth and claw,
With ravine shrieks against our creed.

And may it not be the best arrangement in our human world that hundreds and thousands should die (as we say, prematurely), to make way for successors, while their own life is continued elsewhere?

Thus, on the one side, the fatalist alternative meets us full in the face; and over against it are the signs of disorder, wreck, loss, pain, presenting us with a physical text, which we interpret as *disease*, an element foreign to the perfection of the universe. We may refuse to be dragged either into the Scylla or Charybdis of this philosophical antinomy. But we can only do so by the recognition of a Living Will ruling the universe beneficently. The theistic faith and prayer do not remove the mystery which shrouds it, but they relieve its forward pressure.

History and experience alike testify that the power of prayer is simply immeasurable. Though to approach God with endless and irregular requests, soliciting him for favors instead of arising to do his will, or acquiescing in it, is unquestionable irreverence; no theory of causation can rob the heart of its right to pray "without ceasing," or the intellect of its assurance that spiritual "prayer availeth much." Mutual concessions, such as those which often end the strife of rival litigants, are unknown in philosophical controversy. But it would promote a better understanding between fellow-workers in the cause of humanity, were our theologians and teachers

of science to bestow upon each other a more frank, ungrudging recognition, and to say, as Aprile to Paracelsus, in Browning's noble drama,

Let our God's praise
Go bravely through the world at last:
What care through *thee* or *me*.

ART. IX.—*The Scriptural Doctrine of the Triumph of Christ's Kingdom Distinguished from Millenarianism.*

THE kingdom of Christ is destined to triumph. It will be universal in extent: "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." A higher type of Christian life will be common: "The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold." Civilization will be Christian, and society transfigured into a kingdom of "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," under the spiritual reign of Christ. "In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth." The entire conception of the kingdom is nugatory if it does not include its triumph.

I propose to consider the scriptural doctrine of the triumph of Christ's kingdom, in contrast with Millenarianism.

There is no disagreement on the following points: The final triumph of the kingdom; Christ's second advent; the completion of redemption and the delivery of the kingdom to the Father; the resurrection and general judgment; the eternal, heavenly blessedness of the redeemed going on in ways and methods not revealed to human comprehension.

The millenarian error is essentially this: The dispensation of the Spirit under which we live is not intended to secure the gradual extension and ultimate triumph of the kingdom; the preaching of the gospel to every creature is not intended to convert the world, but to be a witness to all nations; the dispensation of the Spirit, therefore, will fail to effect the tri-

umph of the kingdom, but is intended only as a preparation for it; the kingdom is to come hereafter and suddenly, at Christ's second advent. When the gospel shall have been preached as a witness to all nations, and the failure of the dispensation of the Spirit shall have become apparent, Christ will come in the clouds, will destroy by natural and supernatural judgments the anti-Christian powers, "except a residue certain, but indefinite;" "will raise from the dead the elect of past ages;" "take to a place of security all the elect then living," and change or transfigure them in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye; will miraculously subvert and transform the present state of things, purify the earth by the fires of his judgments, deliver it from the curse of sin, and restore it to a paradisiacal state—new heavens and a new earth. "On the restored and purified earth a new social, civil, and ecclesiastical organization shall be set up among the generations of men then ensuing, who will be all converted by the continual presence and power of the Holy Ghost, so as was unknown in the preceding ages." Over this renovated society Christ will reign in person, and "sit as king upon his holy hill of Zion," assisted by the risen saints, who shall preside with him over "the successive generations and inhabitants of the repopled earth." "After this millennial age—the great theme of prophecy—the seventh decade—the Sabbath of time"—Satan will be loosed for a season to deceive the nations; will gather the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth to battle; God will then send fire out of heaven to devour the hostile forces that shall compass the camp of the saints and the beloved city; will raise the rest of the dead, and award the sentence of the final judgment.*

In opposition to this, the scriptural doctrine is: Christ sets up his kingdom at his first coming. After his ascension, he reigns in heaven over his kingdom on earth, and administers its government, and advances it to its triumph through the Holy Spirit; the dispensation of the Spirit is the last; in it, by the efforts of Christ's redeemed going into all the world and preaching the gospel to every creature, the kingdom of

* President Nathan Lord's *Essay on the Millennium*, pp. 35-39.

heaven—being spiritual, and coming not with observation—will gradually grow like a seed, and extend like leaven, till at last it will pervade the world with its life, and “the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord.” This happy condition will be of long continuance. Whether this period will be followed or not by an apostasy, in the fullness of time Christ will come in the clouds; the dead will be raised, and the living changed; the earthly work of redemption will be completed, and the kingdom presented to the Father; the final judgment will be pronounced, and the righteous shall go away into everlasting life. In connection with this will be a grand epoch in the physical world, represented by the earth being burned up and the elements melting in fervent heat, preparatory to a new cycle of the divine manifestations, which the glorified in heaven will see, but which it is not permitted us to understand.

Among millenarians there are many differences as to details, and not a few extravagances.* But the more judicious millenarians are not to be held responsible for peculiarities and extravagances of opinion which they do not accept.

I. The literalism insisted on by millenarians is a false and impossible system of interpretation.

The argument is, that prophecies so explicit as that of the first resurrection (Rev. xx.), the establishment and exaltation of the mountain of the house of the Lord (Micah iv. 1, 2), the standing of the Lord's feet on the Mount of Olives, and the cleavage of the mount, and its removal, half to the north and half to the south (Zech. xi. 4), must be literal; and that, if they are interpreted as figurative, or as symbolical of events in the progress of Christ's kingdom under the dispensation of the Spirit, every prophecy and promise of the Bible may be explained away and divested of its literal and obvious meaning.

This is a plausible way of putting it, and probably is more

* “The king is a perfect human being, the Son of man and the Son of God; now possessed of flesh and bones, but not of blood, because that he shed for the race of Adam.”—[Prophetic Expositions, by Josiah Litch, vol. i., pp. 17, 18. Mr. Litch was a follower of Wm. Miller, whose millenarianism differed in several particulars from that which is described above.

effective with the popular mind than any other argument; especially when accompanied by an appeal to the importance of adhering to the literal historical sense of the Bible, in opposition to rationalistic interpretations. My limits forbid a complete answer to this argument, which would require an extended exposition of the principles regulating the interpretation of figurative language and of symbols, and of their application to the figures and symbols of the Bible. I will confine myself to two remarks.

In the first place, this reasoning leads to conclusions so extravagant as to prove that there is a fallacy in it. David N. Lord, lately editor of the *Theological and Literary Journal*, and a most able advocate of millenarianism, insists that the eighteenth Psalm describes a literal deliverance of David, not elsewhere historically recorded, and wrought with all the sublime visible and miraculous manifestations there set forth. The argument would be, if these are not literal, how can we prove from any words of Scripture that God ever made any visible manifestation of himself to men? * The same reasoning would require us to interpret as literal history the familiar hymn beginning,

Once on the raging seas I rode;
The storm was loud, the night was dark.

By similar reasoning Mr. Lord is driven to the conclusion that the carnivorous animals mentioned in Isaiah (xi. 6-9) will be transformed into graminivorous animals and continue to exist in the millennial period. † Some millenarians are led by similar reasoning to maintain that the prophecies teach not only the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine, but also the revival of circumcision, sacrifices, and the temple-worship. ‡ The same principles of interpretation must carry us still farther. Ezekiel prophesies that in the future triumph of Israel David shall be their king forever. § Literalism requires that it shall be David in his own person who is to reign

* Treatise on Figurative Language, by D. N. Lord, pp. 191, 192.

† *Theological and Literary Journal*, vol. i., pp. 386-390, and vol. iii., p. 601.

‡ *Theological and Literary Journal*, vol. ii., pp. 262, 266, 457, 472.

§ Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24, and xxxvii. 23, 24.

over the renovated earth forever. In truth this method of interpretation is precisely that of the Jews in interpreting the prophecies of the Messiah's first coming. If it is the right method, the Jews were right in expecting Elijah to come in his own person, and not merely one coming in Elijah's spirit and power; and in expecting the Messiah to set up a temporal kingdom and be a mighty conqueror, according to the predictions in Psalms ii. and cx. Since events have proved that this is a wrong method of interpreting the prophecies of Christ's first coming, it must be equally wrong in interpreting the prophecies of his second advent.

President Lord insists that the millenarian doctrine is necessary from the historical character of redemption; that to deny it is to abandon this simple historical character and to substitute for it speculation and rationalism.* But this position is not well taken. The doctrine that Christ's second advent will follow the millennial triumph of the Church, emphasizes the historical character of Christianity, and distinguishes it from rationalism as really as does the doctrine of his pre-millennial advent. The difference pertains to the question, What are the future events predicted, and the order of their occurrence? not at all to the question whether Christianity is a philosophy or an historical redemption. President Lord here uses an argument *ad invidiam* which his character and standing would not have led us to expect.

My second remark, respecting the principles of interpretation which we are considering, is, that their incorrectness is exposed by reducing them to a precise and definite statement. This Mr. D. N. Lord has attempted to do. The third principle of figurative language which he lays down is: "The figurative terms are always predicates, or are employed in affirming something of some other agent or object."† It is not easy to apply this principle to such expressions as these: "When the cat is away the mice play;" "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." Mr. Lord calls a figure of this kind a *Hypocatastasis*; although he insists that "in that figure, as well as in the metaphor, the trope lies

* Essay, p. 42.† *Theological and Literary Journal*, vol. i., p. 354.

wholly in the predicate, not in the subject to which it is applied." * But though he does call this figure a Hypocatastasis, and insists that the trope is in the predicate, yet it is true that such a figure may run through an entire sentence or series of sentences, and, so far as the sentence or sentences are concerned, with all the appearance of literalness. And the admission that such figures abound in the Bible is the admission of all that is demanded to justify the interpretation of figurative language in the Bible in harmony with the doctrine that Christ's kingdom is to be extended through the world under the dispensation of the Spirit, and before the second coming of our Lord.

Mr. Lord enumerates four hundred and fifteen symbols, which, he says, is the whole number in the Scriptures. From an examination of these and their interpretations, he educes "the laws of symbolic representation." The first is, "that the symbol and that which it symbolizes are of different species or orders, and that the relation of the representative to that which it represents is the relation of analogy." Yet he is obliged to admit this sweeping exception: "When the symbol is of such a nature, or is used in such a condition or relation that there is no analogical agent or object which can represent it, it is then used as its own representative, or the representative of one or more of its own kind." Among the many symbols belonging under this exception, he includes the souls of the martyrs, in Rev. xx., and acknowledges that this vision itself is symbolical. †

It is evident, then, that the argument which we have been considering is a popular appeal, rather than an argument. It legitimately leads to conclusions that are extravagant; and when we attempt to give it definite statement, and to educe the law or principle of interpretation which it involves, it breaks down entirely. Therefore, the doctrine that Christ reigns in heaven over his kingdom on earth, that he administers and advances it through the Holy Spirit, that its triumph will be completed under the dispensation of the Spirit and

* *Theological and Literary Journal*, vol. iii., p. 601.

† *Ibid.* Vol. i., pp. 182, 214, 237, and vol. iii., pp. 669, 670.

antecedent to Christ's second advent, is a doctrine which violates no valid law of interpretation. In advocating it, we cannot be stopped at the outset by the objection that we are forsaking the literal, historical meaning of the Bible for abstractions and fancies. The Bible abounds in imagery and symbols. We approach it recognizing this fact. We determine whether any passage is literal, figurative, or symbolical, from the passage itself and its connection, and in like manner we interpret the figures and symbols which we find.

II. Millenarianism is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Bible as to the time, object, and concomitants of Christ's second coming.

1. Christ's second advent is at the completion of his kingdom on earth, and not at its beginning or establishment.

The dispensation of the Spirit is habitually spoken of as the last, the last time, the completion of the ages (*συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων*, Heb. ix. 26). These texts cannot be explained as denoting the end of a dispensation, for they were applied to the dispensation of the Spirit at its beginning in Christ's first coming. Joel, in the passage quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost, was comparing one dispensation with another; and so Peter applies it.

The kingdom is to be complete at Christ's second coming, and as such to be delivered to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24). Whatever difficulties attend this text, it certainly means that the mediatorial work on earth is finished, the number of the redeemed completed and presented to the Father. And it is certain, from the context, that this delivery of the completed kingdom to the Father is connected with Christ's second advent and the resurrection of the righteous.

Christ's second coming is habitually called the end, and presented as the terminus of all gospel invitation and all Christian endeavor to save men from sin (1 Cor. xv. 24; Matt. xiii. 37-49; xxiv. 31; xxv. 1-13; Luke xix. 13).

2. Christ's second coming is declared to be to judgment, in marked contrast with his first coming, which is declared to be to salvation (John iii. 16, 17; xii. 47, contrasted with Matt. xxv. 31; 2 Thess. i. 6-10).

3. Millenarianism is irreconcilable with the assertions of

the Bible as to the events which will accompany Christ's second coming.

Christ's second coming is to be attended with the resurrection of all the saints who have previously died, and the change of the living saints from corruptible to incorruptible and from mortal to immortality.

It is accompanied, also, by the resurrection of the wicked. The prediction of Daniel (xii. 2) is interpreted by millenarians as a prediction of Christ's second advent; yet it expressly foretells the resurrection both of the righteous and the wicked. Our Saviour predicts the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked (John v. 28, 29). Their resurrection is evidently simultaneous, hearing together the voice of the Son of man; and the dead hearing the voice of the Son of man, and raised thereby, is a form of expression which elsewhere indicates the second coming of Christ.

The second advent is accompanied by the conflagration of the earth, and the saints are caught up away from the earth to meet the Lord in the air. This is entirely incompatible with the continued occupation of the earth by the human race, and the personal reign of Christ at Jerusalem (2 Pet. iii. 7-13; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17). Millenarians resort to various expedients of interpretation to evade this insuperable difficulty, in which they depart very far from the literalism on which they insist in other cases.

Another concomitant of Christ's second coming is the general judgment and the separation of the righteous and the wicked to their final and eternal state (Matt. xvi. 27; xiii. 37-43; xxv. 31-45; 2 Thess. i. 6-10; 2 Tim. iv. 1). The assertion is explicit that the judgment here mentioned is to be at the second coming of the Lord. Millenarians are obliged to interpret these and similar passages as referring to the destruction of the wicked who will be alive on the earth at Christ's second coming. These sublime predictions of the judgment of the wicked mean, therefore, only that a part of the ungodly in the generation living when Christ shall come will be put to a violent death. Universalists do not more violently wrest passages of this sort from their obvious meaning. While thus interpreting passages inconsistent with their own theory,

millenarians cannot consistently enforce their literalism on their opponents.

Millenarians assert the continued existence and propagation of the human race under Christ's millennial reign. The *Theological and Literary Review* asserts that there will be three classes of men—the risen and glorified saints, who will reign with Christ; the saints living at Christ's coming, who by their change will be made immortal, but will not receive the spiritual and glorified body; and the remnant of the wicked who escape destruction at the second coming, and who, being converted, will continue the human race in its natural life from generation to generation. This class President Lord calls "a residue certain but indefinite," who will repeople the earth. All of the foregoing biblical representations are utterly incompatible with the continued existence and propagation of the human race in its natural life after the second advent.

It remains to glance at Rev. xx., which is claimed as teaching a first resurrection and a pre-millennial coming of Christ.

The vision here described is a vision of the *souls* of certain martyrs, who lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. Observe what this vision is not. It is not of a resurrection, but distinctively of the *souls* of martyrs. This is subsequently called the first resurrection. It is not of all the saints, but only of those martyrs who had been beheaded, or, if the several verbs each has a different subject, only of those who had been beheaded and those who had been faithful to Christ under the persecutions and deceitful arts of the beast—whatever particular period that may denote. It is not a vision of Christ's second advent, which is not mentioned, and which necessarily connects itself with the events subsequent to the thousand years, and represented at the close of this chapter and in the next. It is not a vision of Christ's personal reign on earth. It is not said that the thrones seen and the martyrs reigning were on earth; but consistency with the antecedent and subsequent representations of the book requires that the scene of the vision be in heaven. It is not a vision of the destruction of the wicked living on earth; but it is preceded

by a vision of the binding of Satan, and the consequent deliverance of the nations from his temptations and deceits, which indicates their conversion rather than their destruction. In view of the use made of this vision as putting millenarianism beyond all question, it is remarkable to notice what is *not* in it. It is extraordinary reasoning that, because John saw the souls of some of the martyrs living and reigning with Christ in heaven, therefore Christ's advent will be pre-millennial, he will at his coming put the majority of the wicked to a violent death, raise the dead saints and transfigure the living, and reign in person in Jerusalem for a thousand years.

If, therefore, you are constrained to admit that the vision implies a literal resurrection of some of the martyrs in connection with the coming triumph of Christ's kingdom, that carries with it no necessity of admitting millenarianism. Such a resurrection would be analogous to the resurrection of some of the saints when Christ rose, and would be consistent with the triumph of Christ's kingdom before his coming and under the dispensation of the Spirit. This admission, however, the right interpretation of the vision does not require.

The vision presents a symbol of the final triumph of Christ's kingdom and the long continuance of its universal sway. This interpretation is necessary to harmonize this with the whole Apocalypse. To suppose this vision to be of literal historical events, would be to give it an entirely exceptional interpretation. Especially this interpretation harmonizes with the vision of the souls of the martyrs in chap. vi. 9-11. There they are seen under the altar, crying, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" And they are comforted, and bidden to wait a season. There are presented to us the depression and conflict of Christ's Church. In chap. xx. the souls of the martyrs are seen again, not beneath the altar, but reigning with Christ. As the former vision symbolized the Church under oppression and persecution, this necessarily symbolizes the Church in its prosperity and triumph; and there is nothing whatever in it which intimates that its triumph is to be realized any otherwise than under the dispensation of the Spirit, through the faithful efforts of Christians

carrying the gospel to all mankind, and applying its principles to the conduct, usages, laws, and institutions of human life.

III. Millenarianism is inconsistent with the scriptural doctrine of the nature and growth of Christ's kingdom.

1. Christ, at his first coming, came as a King, set up his kingdom, and began his mediatorial reign.

The Jewish prophets predicted the Messiah as a King, coming to establish a kingdom of righteousness and peace, and to extend his reign throughout the world. These are uniformly prophecies of his first coming, the prophecies which created the Jewish expectation of the Messiah, and which Christians believe to have been fulfilled in Jesus. If the Messiah was foretold at all, he was foretold as a King who was to set up a kingdom to endure as long as the sun and moon endure.

Jesus began his preaching by declaring, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." He announced himself as Messianic King; his kingdom was the constant subject of his preaching. He expressly teaches that his kingdom is not of this world, but is spiritual; that at his ascension all power is to be given him in heaven and on earth; that he is to sit at the right hand of the Majesty on high, and reign there as Messianic King, continuing his agency on earth through the Spirit whom he should send. He avowed himself a King to Pilate, and as claiming to be such he was crucified. He is acknowledged as King in the Acts and the Epistles. His common appellation is *κύριος*, or "Lord," a name applied at the time to the Roman emperor. Peter says explicitly, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ. . . . Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour." In the Epistle to the Hebrews we have this explicit declaration: "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting until his enemies be made his footstool." This certainly intimates that there is to be no other mediatorial reign, and that under his reign in heaven he expects the triumph of his kingdom.

Both the Old Testament and the New teach that the media-

torial reign begins in connection with Christ's first coming, and particularly his ascension and the outpouring of the Spirit, and not with his second. So Jesus says: "There be some of them that stand here who shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power."

2. The New Testament, in treating of the growth of Christ's kingdom, emphasizes his humiliation and death, his ascension and intercession, and his sending the Spirit. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me;" "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Jesus also bids his disciples rejoice that he goes away, because it is the appointed condition of the descent of the Holy Spirit; thus implying that his administering his kingdom by the Holy Spirit is better than his personal presence on earth.

3. The kingdom is not of this world, is within the soul, is spiritual and invisible; its progress is gradual, and its coming is without observation. It is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." It is the leaven working unseen within the flour. It is the mustard-seed growing into a tree. Even Daniel's prophecy of the stone smiting the image on the feet, though cited by millenarians to prove that the coming of the kingdom is sudden, miraculous, and public, proves the contrary. It is explicitly said, "*In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed.*" An event yet future cannot be said to happen *in the days of these kings*. And the stone, which represents Christ's kingdom, was at first so small that it could smite the image *on the feet*; and after the image had fallen, the stone grew into a mountain and filled the whole earth.

It should be added, that in the very discourse in which Jesus declares that his kingdom cometh not with observation, but is invisible and internal, he distinguishes it from his second coming, which, he declares, shall be sudden, public, and startling as the lightning.

4. The triumph of the kingdom is dependent on human agency.

The whole scriptural representation is that redemption goes on in human history, and the advance of Christ's kingdom is by human agency. Millenarianism makes the human

element and agency to be only docetic, not a reality. The kingdom is not established by man working together with God, but miraculously, by the Son of God himself. After thousands of years seemingly working in and through and by humanity, he at last breaks free from all human relations and from all the continuity of history, and establishes the kingdom by a miraculous stroke of Almightyness.

5. The kingdom depends for its advancement, under God's Spirit, on truth and love, and not on force.

The genius and spirit of Christianity take men off from the reign of force, and establish the reign of ideas, of truth, and love. But millenarianism strips Christianity of this its essential glory, confesses that the world cannot be saved by truth and love under the dispensation of the Spirit, and falls back on force as that by which alone the kingdom of God can triumph, and on which it ultimately rests. When millenarians are charged with teaching that Christianity is a failure, they reply that, while they do not expect the conversion of the world under the dispensation of the Spirit, they do expect the triumph of Christ's kingdom at his second coming. But I charge them with teaching the failure of Christianity in a sense far more profound. They acknowledge the failure of truth and love by the power of the Spirit to save the world from sin. They acknowledge that the triumph of Christ's kingdom must depend at last on force. Faith in the triumph of ideas and the reign of truth and love by the convincing of men's intellects and the renovation of their wills through the Holy Spirit passes away. The world will be subdued by Almighty power, never converted by redeeming love.

6. The kingdom, as supposed to be realized under Christ's personal reign, would not be a realization of the highest ideal of Christianity.

On the one hand, it presents a semi-sensuous paradise. It does not concentrate the Christian's efforts on attaining an overcoming faith, a divine love and purity, as constituting blessedness or true well-being under whatever circumstances; it rather leads to waiting and longing for an adjustment of outward circumstances to make life blessed. It does not set the Christian's heart on toiling and, if necessary, suffering

to deliver men from error and sin, as constituting their misery; it rather leads them to wait supinely for the coming of the Saviour to rid them of their enemies by his destroying sword. It tends, therefore, to ascetic disgust with life, and separation from the world, instead of a compassionate and Christ-like interest in the world to save men from misery and sin. Thus it unconsciously runs into that false philosophy which places blessedness in indulgence and gratification, to the abandonment of the Christian and only true philosophy that man's blessedness consists in his character and action, rather than in his circumstances and possessions; in what he is, rather than in what he has; in working, and serving, and achieving, rather than in receiving and being indulged. "All that is in the world passeth away; but he that *doeth* the will of God abideth forever."

On the other hand, the conception of the personal reign supposes the introduction into the natural life of men of the elements of the heavenly state, and a consequent state of things in which the interests and affairs of man's natural life seem insignificant and out of place.

Thus the personal reign, anticipated as the issue of all Christian endeavor, vitiates the Christian character and life in the present dispensation.

IV. Millenarianism gives no satisfactory theodicy, or vindication of the ways of God with man.

It affords no tolerable explanation of the delay in the coming and triumph of Christ's kingdom, nor of all the processes and agencies during the long ages preceding it. The true doctrine is, that redemption must of necessity enter into humanity, act through human agencies, and realize its results through the courses and the continuity of human history. It follows that God's redeeming love may fail of bringing man at once to him; that the growth of his kingdom must be modified by the human element connected with it; and thus that only in the fullness of time and through innumerable trials and difficulties can the kingdom possess the earth.

But if, after all, the kingdom is not to be established in this way, if all God's working in and by humanity and in the courses of history is to be a failure, and the Messiah is at last

to throw himself clear from all the human elements and historical courses through which he has worked so long, and to set up his kingdom by sheer Almightyness, no reason can be given why that might not have been accomplished four thousand years ago as well as now. Redemption ceases to be a true and satisfactory philosophy of human history; it becomes something outside of it and above it, and is consummated at last in a violent disruption of all the continuity of that history. And every explanation of the slow progress of Christ's kingdom, founded on the fact that it is advanced in humanity and by human agency, ceases to be available.

V. The practical influence of millenarianism is evil.

It takes away the most powerful motives to Christian endeavor, and tends to an incomplete type of Christian life.

It is the glory of Christianity that it first and alone has spoken the word of promise and of hope to man, and predicted for mankind in the progress of Christ's kingdom a future on the earth ever better than the past. Under the stimulus of this promise civilization has become progressive, and progressive in justice and love to man. Under this stimulus Christians have learned to have faith in truth, and right, and love, and in God's present and redeeming grace. In this faith and hope they are valiant for the truth; believing that, however opposed, it will through the influence of God's Spirit establish itself, and find expression in the lives of individuals, and in the customs, laws, and institutions of society.

Millenarianism "keeps the word of promise to our ear, and breaks it to our hope." It dissociates the triumph of Christ's kingdom in the future from its antecedent progress, and from the endeavors of Christians to advance it. The triumph comes at last miraculously, magically, by the stroke of Almightyness, with no dependence on previous fidelity to truth, and right, and God; by occasion, indeed, of the persistence and prevalence of sin, not of the persistence and prevailing power of Christ's saints.

Modern progress is humanitarian. Christian civilization is characterized by regard for man, by the recognition of his individual personality, which can never be absorbed and lost either in race or organization; of his greatness and the sacred-

ness of his rights; of the principle that institutions exist for man, not man for his institutions; of the brotherhood of all nations; of the obligation to turn human endeavor in every line of thought and action to the promotion of human welfare. It will be characterized by the recognition of the Christian law of service restraining the self-assertion and rapacious self-seeking of individualism, and leading men to live not for themselves, but for others. In our modern apologetics we insist that the world owes these ideas to Christ. But the millenarian system has no place for these ideas. Christianity, as that system presents it, does not aim to renovate society by truth and love. It aims in the present dispensation only to save a few elected ones from the pains of eternal death, while it looks to the total overthrow of the existing state of society and the re-creation of the earth itself preparatory to the miraculous establishment of a preternatural kingdom, having no dependence whatever on the present progress of Christian civilization or the Christian culture of men. It therefore repudiates the promise and hope of human progress, and declares them delusions of philosophy and rationalism, and no part or incident of Christianity. It therefore must regard Christianity, in its very conception, alien from all efforts to put an end to slavery and tyranny, and to reform social abuses, and thus it gives its support to an argument which is at this day prolific of skepticism, that Christianity is not in sympathy with human progress. It must insist that the one business of Christianity is to convert souls—to save a few, if possible, from eternal death amid the hopeless errors, sins, and sufferings of the present state. President Lord, for example, declares that one of “the appalling practical consequences” of the current belief is that “Christian men and ministers of the gospel . . . are wasting much of their energies upon delusive schemes of educating, reforming, and reorganizing society, with a view to its supposed development into a perfect state.”*

The Christian, it is indeed admitted, is required to work for Christ; for the command is, “Occupy till I come.” But he is to work with the deadening consciousness that his efforts

* Essay, pp. 46, 47.

will fail to make the world better. President Lord says: "It is historically and certainly evident that hitherto every tribe, nation, and race of men on the earth—a few righteous men alone excepted—have successively declined into greater wickedness, and that at this present time Christianity is spreading in the world in no proportion to the increase of the wicked population of the globe and the spread of atheistic, pantheistic, or polytheistic belief. . . . The rapid development of our present worldly civilization is more and more alienating society from God, and making it more difficult for his servants to preserve themselves in the simplicity of their faith." * So it is to be until Christ shall come. Under the dead weight of this certainty Christians are to fulfill the command, "Occupy till I come." They are to toil and suffer, knowing that all their efforts avail nothing to establish the kingdom of righteousness and peace on earth.

In the light of the Christian promise rightly understood, we accept Christian work as a privilege, because in it we are wokers together with God to save sinners from their sins, to multiply the number of Christian workers, to hasten the deliverance of the world from its sin and misery, and to advance the Christianizing of civilization and the progress and universal prevalence of Christ's kingdom. Work thus becomes a part of the Christian's education. It trains him to love all men as Christ did, to be valiant for the truth, and to be strong in faith and hope; it develops a broad and intense interest in humanity and in all that affects human welfare, and creates a large-hearted, genial, and healthful Christian manhood. Millenarianism, teaching the inevitable failure of all efforts to reform and renovate society, deadens the interest in human affairs, trains the Christian to disgust with life and a desire to flee from the world in order to save himself from its dangers, and to nurse his own spiritual emotions in retirement rather than to interest in toil for the world's renovation. It trains him to a longing to die in order to escape from the toil and conflicts of the Christian—a saintliness which is ungenial, ghastly, and remote from all the interests of human life.

* Essay, p. 27.

BOOK NOTICES.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis, with a New Translation. By JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., T.C.D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast, author of "Commentaries on Exodus and Leviticus." With a Preface by J. P. THOMPSON, D.D., New York City. And an Introduction by ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., President of Newton Theological Institution, and Professor of Theology and Christian Ethics.

The extreme intellectual activity of this age is truly wonderful. Could Solomon have had this period of time in view when he declared that of "making many books there is no end"? If he saw our day by prophetic ken, and noted its tireless energy, he might well have recorded in advance the fact that he has stated. On all subjects of possible interest to mankind, heavenly, earthly, and sub-terrestrial, on mind and matter in every conceivable feature, relation, and constituent, the mental powers of men have been employed with great zeal, assiduity, and acumen. Much that is of little value to the world, and much of positive evil, have the rapid presses thrown out before the common eye, while we are happy to know that much also has been accomplished in all departments of desirable and useful knowledge. No one realm of investigation and information has received more thorough, capable, and conscientious attention than the department of biblical criticism. In every view of the subject, didactic, polemic, exegetical, or severely critical, the energies of a host of most sterling and accomplished inquirers have been engaged in opening up the rich mines of truth stored in the Word of God.

Among those works which have resulted from the pervading and abiding interest connected with the records of the world's earliest history, the commentary of Dr. Murphy is welcomed as a very valuable contribution to our means of extended and accurate information. It is presented in a form which enables

the reader to investigate the subjects systematically. As we should expect, the first part of the Book of Genesis is treated at considerable length, and very carefully. The new translation of the original Hebrew affords many shades of meaning and important suggestions throughout the work. The first four chapters occupy a space of one hundred and fifty pages, and, like the remainder of the book, is divided into sections and general subjects. While scholars are well employed in studying this work, the general reader finds ample reasons for rejoicing in the clear and strong views of the vast themes connected with old-time history.

The wonderful comprehensiveness and the deep impressiveness of the author's style will strikingly appear, and at the same time a most valuable, synthetical view of the subject will be presented by quoting the full-length comment of Dr. Murphy on the first verse in the Word of God, which he translates thus: "In the beginning had God created the heavens and the earth."

The following is his remarkable exposition of this passage, divested of preceding verbal criticisms:

This great introductory sentence of the book of God is equal in weight to the whole of its subsequent communications concerning the kingdom of nature.

It assumes the existence of God; for it is he who in the beginning creates. It assumes his eternity; for he is before all things; and as nothing comes from nothing, he himself must have always been. It implies his omnipotence; for he creates the universe of things. It implies his absolute freedom; for he begins a new course of action. It implies his infinite wisdom; for a *cosmos*, an order of matter and mind, can only come from a being of absolute intelligence. It implies his essential goodness; for the Sole, Eternal, Almighty, All-wise, and All-sufficient Being has no reason, no motive, and no capacity for evil. It presumes him to be beyond all limit of time and place, as he is before all time and place.

It asserts the creation of the heavens and the earth; that is, of the universe of mind and matter. This creating is the omnipotent act of giving existence to things which before had no existence. This is the first great mystery of things, as the end is the second. Natural science observes things as they are, when they have already laid hold of existence. It ascends into the past as far as observation will reach, and penetrates into the future as far as experience will guide. But it does not touch the beginning or the end. This first sentence of revelation, however, records the beginning. At the same time it involves the progressive development of that which is begun, and so contains within its bosom the whole of what is revealed in the book of God. It is thus historical of the beginning, and prophetic of the whole of time. It is, therefore, equivalent to all the rest of revelation taken together, which merely records the evolutions of one sphere of creation, and nearly and more nearly anticipates the end of present things.

This sentence assumes the being of God, and asserts the beginning of things. Hence it intimates that the existence of God is more immediately patent to the reason of man than the creation of the universe. And this is agreeable to the philosophy of things; for the existence of God is a necessary and eternal truth, more and more self-evident to the intellect as it rises to maturity. But the beginning of things is, by its very nature, a contingent event, which once was not and then came to be contingent on the free will of the Eternal, and, therefore, not evident to reason itself, but made known to the understanding by testimony and the reality of things. This sentence is the testimony, and the actual world in us and around us is the reality. Faith takes account of the one, observation of the other.

It bears on the very face of it the indication that it was written by man, and for man; for it divides all things into the heavens and the earth. Such a division evidently suits those only who are inhabitants of the earth. Accordingly, this sentence is the foundation-stone of the history, not of the universe at large, of the sun, of any other planet, but of the earth, and of man, its rational inhabitant. The primeval event which it records may be far distant, in point of time, from the next event in such a history; as the earth may have existed myriads of ages, and undergone many vicissitudes in its condition, before it became the home of the human race. And, for aught we know, the history of other planets, even of the solar system, may yet be unwritten, because there has been as yet no rational inhabitant to compose or peruse the record. We have no intimation of the interval of time that elapsed between the beginning of things narrated in this prefatory sentence and that state of things which is announced in the following verse.

With no less clearness, however, does it show that it was dictated by superhuman knowledge; for it records the beginning of things of which natural science can take no cognizance. Man observes certain laws of nature, and, guided by these may trace the current of physical events backward and forward, but without being able to fix any limit to the course of nature in either direction. And not only this sentence, but the main part of this and the following chapter communicates events that occurred before man made his appearance on the stage of things, and therefore before he could either witness or record them. And in harmony with all this, the whole volume is proved by the topics chosen, the revelations made, the views entertained, the ends contemplated, and the means of information possessed, to be derived from a higher source than man.

This simple sentence denies atheism; for it assumes the being of God. It denies polytheism, and, among its various forms, the doctrine of two eternal principles, the one good and the other evil; for it confesses the one Eternal Creator. It denies materialism; for it asserts the creation of matter. It denies pantheism; for it assumes the existence of God before all things, and apart from them. It denies fatalism; for it involves the freedom of the Eternal Being.

It indicates the relative superiority, in point of magnitude, of the heavens to the earth, by giving the former the first place in the order of words. It is thus in accordance with the first elements of astronomical science.

It is therefore pregnant with physical and metaphysical, with ethical and theological instruction for the first man, for the predecessors and contemporaries of Moses, and for all the succeeding generations of mankind.

This verse forms an integral part of the narrative, and not a mere heading, as some have imagined. This is abundantly evident from the following reasons: 1. It has the form of a narrative, not of a superscription. 2. The conjunctive particle connects the second verse with it, which could not be if it were a heading. 3. The

very next sentence speaks of the earth as already in existence, and therefore its creation must be recorded in the first verse. 4. In the first verse the heavens take precedence of the earth, but in the following verses all things, even the sun, moon, and stars, seem to be but appendages to the earth. Thus, if it were a heading, it would not correspond with the narrative. 5. If the first verse belong to the narrative, order pervades the whole recital; whereas, if it be a heading, the most hopeless confusion enters. Light is called into being before the sun, moon, and stars. The earth takes precedence of the heavenly luminaries. The stars, which are coordinate with the sun, and preöordinate to the moon, occupy the third place in the narrative of their manifestation. For any or all of these reasons it is obvious that the first verse forms a part of the narrative.

As soon as it is settled that the narrative begins in the first verse, another question comes up for determination, namely, whether the heavens here mean the heavenly bodies that circle in their courses through the realms of space, or the mere space itself which they occupy with their perambulations. It is manifest that the heavens here denote the heavenly orbs themselves—the celestial mansions with their existing inhabitants—for the following cogent reasons: 1. Creation implies something created, and not mere space, which is nothing, and cannot be said to be created. 2. As the earth here obviously means the substance of the planet we inhabit, so, by parity of reason, the heavens must mean the substance of the celestial luminaries, the heavenly hosts of stars and spirits. 3. The heavens are placed before the earth, and therefore must mean that reality which is greater than the earth, for if they meant space, and nothing real, they ought not to be before the earth. 4. The heavens are actually *mentioned* in the verse, and therefore must mean a real thing, for if they meant nothing at all, they ought not to be mentioned. 5. The heavens must denote the heavenly realities, because this imparts a rational order to the whole chapter; whereas an unaccountable derangement appears if the sun, moon, and stars do not come into existence till the fourth day, though the sun is the center of light and the measurer of the daily period. For any or all of these reasons, it is undeniable that the heavens in the first verse mean the fixed and planetary orbs of space, and, consequently, that these uncounted tenants of the skies, along with our own planet, are all declared to be in existence before the commencement of the six days' creation.

Hence it appears that the first verse records an event antecedent to those described in the subsequent verses. This is the absolute and aboriginal creation of the heavens and all that in them is, and of the earth in its primeval state. The former includes all those resplendent spheres which are spread before the wondering eye of man, as well as those hosts of planets and of spiritual and angelic beings which are beyond the range of his natural vision. This brings a simple and unforced meaning out of the whole chapter, and discloses a beauty and a harmony in the narrative which no other interpretation can afford. In this way the subsequent verses reveal a new effort of creative power, by which the pre-adamic earth, in the condition in which it appears in the second verse, is fitted up for the residence of a fresh animal creation, including the human race. The process is represented as it would appear to primeval man in his infantile simplicity, with whom his own position would naturally be the fixed point to which every thing else was to be referred.

An American Dictionary of the English Language. By NOAH WEBSTER, LL.D. Thoroughly revised and greatly enlarged and improved. By CHAUNCEY A. GOODRICH, D.D., late Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory, and also Professor of the

Pastoral Charge, and NOAH PORTER, D.D., LL.D., President, of Yale College. Springfield, Mass. Published by G. & C. Merriam, State street. 1872.

The publishers of this great work have placed a copy of it upon our table, and it is with much pleasure that we hereby contribute our testimony to its inestimable value. On all points of lexicography it is without doubt one of the very highest authorities to which reference can be had for the settlement of difficult and disputable questions. Its present expansion is the outgrowth of many years of close and persistent inquiry into all departments of human knowledge. The learning of mankind has been condensed in its pages, and is made to present it as a most astonishing *microcosm* of information. The more this work is studied, the more the thought impresses itself upon the mind, that the most thorough and exhaustive toil has been given to bring results to their fullest development. It is as if some old and commanding university had bestowed the labors of its whole corps of disciplined and accomplished instructors upon the different and complex subjects of investigation which appear within the lids of this mighty quarto, and then, after manifold emendations and improvements by comparative philology, had gathered the vast treasures of wisdom into one and formed "Webster's Unabridged Dictionary."

The edition before us is the very latest in important results, and it contains many words not found in former editions. The progress of science and art in all directions has a manifest and remarkable reflection from these broad and jeweled pages. Leaving the body of the work, where studies in language, definitions in mathematics, investigations and explorations in all science and every art enrich and adorn each column, and where familiarity with all modes of life and all human history makes its presence felt in a thousand ways and places, let us briefly notice the contents of the Appendix.

"The Etymological Vocabulary of Modern Geographical Names" gives a very instructive and entertaining account of the origin of a vast number of words applied to all manner of objects on the surface of the earth. One of its most pleasing features is the definition of names of mountain ranges,

rivers, lakes, etc., in our own country, with which we have been familiar from childhood.

Equally useful, and even more so to the reader of history, are the "Pronouncing Vocabulary of Modern Geographical and Biographical Names," and the "Pronouncing Vocabulary of Common English Christian Names."

Many valuable items of information are gained from the "Quotations, Words, Phrases, etc., from Greek, Latin, and Modern Foreign Languages," and from "Abbreviations and Contractions in Writing." Of course the Vocabularies of Greek, Latin, Scriptural, and Modern Geographical Names, are already before the public generally, and we need not repeat how very important they are to the intelligent reader.

There is but one more feature of this vast volume to which attention is called, and that is the beautiful illustrations. These have reference to all manner of objects in natural history, the fine and mechanic arts, and other things. They are scattered through the body of the work, at their proper places, and are then gathered at its close and exhibited in immediate connection, and afford interest and instruction for many hours of study or recreation.

It is unnecessary to say that the publishers have got up this great book in a style worthy of its high value. For a copy of it, send to the publishers, or to W. E. Dunaway, Agent, 41 Union street, Nashville, Tenn., as the latter keeps it constantly on hand.

A Scriptural View of the Office of the Holy Spirit. By R. RICHARDSON. Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase & Hall, publishers, No. 180 Elm street. 1873. Price \$1.50. Pp. 324.

Historically and exegetically this work is of value to one who wishes to see an extended account of the nature, manifestations, influences, and relations of the Holy Spirit. There are many important and striking truths set forth in its pages, and the author really seems to be a *spiritually-minded* man. To some—and these are leading positions—we take exception, and yet the design of the author is clear enough to mislead no thoughtful person, while he will doubtless benefit many. Summing up his positions in regard to "the gift of the Spirit," the author says: "This is the completion of that system of

things through which man is to be renewed 'after the image of Him that created him.' In the divine order relating to man we have: 1. The word of God, or gospel. 2. Hearing. 3. Faith. 4. Repentance. 5. Baptism. 6. Remission of sins. 7. The gift of the Holy Spirit." Any who may desire an extended view of the "system" of which this epitome forms the central light, should send for this book.

Among the vital doctrines of our holy religion is, as we view it, undeniably to be placed the scriptural doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is so intimately associated with the doctrine of atonement for the sins of the world that, as the latter is presented as indispensable to the pardon of sin, the former is proclaimed as equally indispensable to the removal of that spiritual defilement which is the legitimate result of transgression of law. The great fact of the fall of man into a state of guilt, condemnation, and wretchedness has, so to speak, necessitated the additional great fact of a plan of recovery for him, prompted by the love and instituted by the wisdom of God. That is, if man, after his fall, is to be allowed a second opportunity of probation, it evidently must be provided by the grace of God, and on the highest principles of divine administration. Accordingly we find in the word of God, that as man was placed under a covenant of works at first, and proved himself unfaithful to the high compact, God, in the exercise of great mercy, provided redemption for him, which was to be realized by faith in a Saviour who should become the redeemer of his nature from the bondage of sin. The covenant of grace, we find, contemplated man's twofold loss, and proposed to restore to him a position and character fully indemnifying him against all future loss, and compensating him for all the evils of the past. His twofold loss was legal and moral—that is, it was a loss by which man became utterly bankrupt in law, and unfit to stand in the presence of a holy God. He had violated the law, and thereby become guilty and corrupt, so that he could not meet the lawful claims of justice and holiness.

The alternative of mercy shown or justice done was full of everlasting interest to man, and in case the former should be exhibited, it became the wisdom of God to provide against

all the evils resulting from man's sin and fall. To do this, a Saviour was actually given who became man, but bore the perfect character of Divinity also, that he might be a complete deliverer. That Saviour in his life obeyed the law perfectly, so that "He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." He moreover "gave his life a ransom for many," for "God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."

Thus the Divine love provided redemption for sinners from "the curse of the law," because Christ was "made a curse" for them. The legal barrier to man's salvation was removed by Jesus Christ. But morally this redemption did not, could not, touch man's character without his consent. To gain this, the Holy Spirit's influence was given, first, to "reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," and having secured man's full and hearty consent to be saved personally, then the Holy Spirit's glorious office was and is, secondly, to cleanse the heart and fit man spiritually for the Kingdom of Grace. This is according to the apostolic teaching, when it is said to Titus of the former spiritual state of believers, "For we ourselves were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

In this passage it is manifest that the apostle means to say that the mercy of God is the source whence proceeded the salvation of men, and that the Holy Spirit is the agent by whom the actual and effectual work is done. As far as man is concerned, his natural condition is one represented as being "foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating." This fearful picture of human depravity exhibits man's mental, moral, and active state—that is, mind, heart, and life are all

declared to be wrong and evil in the sight of God. The mind by nature, because of the curse of sin, is "foolish" and "deceived;" the heart is "hateful and hating;" while the life, prompted and flowing out of the heart and mind, is "disobedient," "serving divers lusts and pleasures," and "living in malice and envy."

Now, as this is man's natural state, the apostle wishes it clearly understood that no "works of righteousness"—that is, no deeds performed by the sinner to secure favor under the law of God—can save the soul; but that, in order to be "made heirs according to the hope of eternal life," men must be "justified by grace" (upon their exercise of faith, Rom. v. 1), and then the actual, saving mercy of God is realized "by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," which blessed gift is bestowed "abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

This view of the subject seems to present a complete and glorious gospel to men. The tidings of a Saviour given to us become indeed "good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people," when all people are informed that the grace and salvation provided by this wondrous Saviour of sinners, are to be not only proclaimed to all men by the voices of consecrated ministers, but to be rendered efficacious and experimental by the influence of the omnipresent and omnipotent Spirit of God to all who humbly and penitently believe in Jesus.

In the Gospel by John (chapters i., iii., xiv., xv., xvi.), the work of the Holy Spirit is clearly and strongly presented. In the first chapter, it is said of the coming of Jesus to the Jews: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This, of course, is the record of events and teachings before the formal introduction of the Holy Spirit's miraculous manifestations. It alludes to the ordinary, not the extraordinary, influences and gifts of the Spirit. The Saviour expands the doctrine of "being born of God," in the third chapter of John, in his conversation with Nico-

demus: "Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

The part of a sentence in this passage which speaks of being "born of water" is not at all difficult, because Jesus Christ meant simply to teach that "ruler of the Jews" that he and all others, however honorable and wise, must be perfectly willing to submit to the odium attached to his name and cause, and must come out openly and receive baptism as the sign of his spiritual birth into the kingdom of God, or else he could not enter that kingdom. Nicodemus came to Jesus with the conviction that the latter was a "teacher come from God," and so began his conversation. Jesus stopped all vain questionings by cutting away at once all outside issues and coming to the very heart of his great practical doctrines, and pressing *the new birth* home to the conscience of his auditor. Nicodemus was disposed to put the question, "How?" Jesus reiterated his statement, and expanded it enough to show him that there are a *natural* birth and a *spiritual* birth, which have their peculiar characteristics, unmistakable, marked, and distinct. Flesh produces flesh; Spirit begets spirit. Spiritual birth is mysterious (as if he had said), and it is best known or described to others by its *effects*, as the wind is thus best known or described as to its coming and going. One thing Nicodemus and all men were taught by this conversation, and that is, man must be "born of God," "of the Spirit," "born again," or from above. Birth "of blood, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man," will not do for a substitute to this grand, essential thing, "being born of God." Birth "of water"

may and does publicly introduce a person before men into the organized and visible kingdom of God, the Church, and without it such person is not recognized as having entered that kingdom visible, but only by being "born of the Spirit" is man permitted to enter that "kingdom of God" which is composed of all on earth whose *hearts are right in the sight of God* (unlike the baptized Simon Magus), and all who have already passed into the eternal home of the true children of the Divine Father. Therefore, let no man confound the two ideas of birth by water and birth by the Holy Spirit. They are by no means identical, but, on the contrary, are essentially distinct and peculiar in nature, and are so to be preached to mankind in full view of the highest interest and happiness of human existence. Mistake at this point is fatal, and may be final and eternal. Entering a given Church is one thing, and entering into the bond of the everlasting covenant with God through the grace of Jesus Christ, by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, is another and very different thing. The one may be all form; the other must be in all sincerity, and with profound earnestness of soul.

In order to present some farther views of this important subject, let us consider for a time the words of the Great Teacher again, as recorded in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters of John's Gospel. Look at the last chapter first. Jesus there is speaking of his departure from them, and his disciples are sad at the announcement of it. He is encouraging them, and says: "But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."

On this passage it is unnecessary to multiply words, as we have already stated the main point presented in it, viz.: The function of convicting power possessed by the Holy Spirit. The Lord Jesus here most unequivocally and clearly states it

to be the prerogative of the Holy Spirit to produce conviction of sin in the minds of men. Whether that conviction or reproof should be the result of instrumentalities, such as the truth in general, read or preached, the Divine Master does not say, but the inference is that at least ordinarily it should be so, as he speaks of the sin of unbelief as to himself and his great work. But the leading thought here is that he who was to be the Comforter of the humble believers and followers of Christ was to *reprove* or *convince* wicked men of their sins, and show them the evil of those sins, with the purpose evidently of leading them to "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." This peculiar office of the Divine Spirit we understand to be perpetual, until the dispensation of that Spirit is closed up with the triumph of the kingdom of Christ among all nations. The gospel is to be preached, and the Word of God disseminated in all languages, until the precious truth, the grand central doctrine of a Saviour given to man, shall be possessed by the human race. But with the preaching of that holy gospel, and the dissemination of that blessed word of life, the Holy Spirit is to go and render them effectual in opening the human understanding to a clear apprehension of their meaning, and in impressing the human heart with their benign influence. Jesus Christ is the light of the world spiritually considered, and the Holy Spirit's glorious work is to take that light and set it within the soul of man, to show him the ruin which sin has wrought there, and also the source whence a complete restoration of moral strength, harmony, and beauty can be secured. Blessed work and blessed Agent of so holy an office! May his saving power be felt more and more, until the universal heart of man shall acknowledge the Divine Instructor and the glorious Subject of his teaching!

Having thus stated the office of the Holy Spirit with especial relation to unconverted men, the next thought is that presented by the Lord Jesus in several passages in the chapters above referred to. Speaking of his personal departure, and cheering the disciples' hearts, he tells them: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth," etc. Again:

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Again: "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." Once more: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

As expressive of a very clear and forcible view of the leading thought in these words of Jesus, we quote from an elegant author, on the name and office of the Comforter:

"Jesus had been to them (the disciples) a counselor, a guide, a friend, while he was with them. He had instructed them, had borne with their prejudices and ignorance, and had administered consolation to them in the times of despondency. But he was about to leave them now to go alone into an unfriendly world. The *other* Comforter was to be given as a compensation for his absence, or to perform the offices toward them which *he* would have done if he had remained personally with them. And from this we may learn, in part, what is the office of the Spirit. *It is to furnish to all Christians the instruction and consolation which would be given by the personal presence of Jesus.* (See last verse above).

"To the apostles, it was particularly to inspire them with the knowledge of all truth. Besides this, he came to convince men of sin. It was proper that such an Agent should be sent into the world. 1st. Because it was a part of the plan that Jesus should ascend to heaven after his death. 2d. Unless some heavenly Agent should be sent to carry forward the work of salvation, man would reject it and perish. 3d. Jesus could not be personally and bodily present in all places with the vast multitudes who should believe on him. The Holy Spirit is omnipresent, and can reach them all. 4th. It was manifestly a part of the plan of redemption that each of the

persons of the Trinity should perform his appropriate work—the Father in sending his Son, the Son in making atonement and interceding, and the Spirit in applying the work to the hearts of men.

“The word ‘comforter’ is frequently used by the Greek writers to denote an *advocate* in a court; one who intercedes, a monitor, a teacher, an assistant, a helper. It is somewhat difficult, therefore, to fix the precise meaning of the word. It may be translated either advocate, monitor, teacher, or helper. What the office of the Holy Spirit in this respect is, is to be learned from what we are elsewhere told he does. We learn, particularly from the accounts that our Saviour gives of his work, that that office was, 1st. To *comfort* the disciples; to be with them in his absence and to supply his place, and this is properly expressed by the word *comforter*. 2d. To *teach* them, or remind them of truth, and this might be expressed by the word *monitor*, or *teacher*. 3d. To *aid* them in their work; to advocate their cause, or to assist them in advocating the cause of religion in the world, and in bringing sinners to repentance, and this may be expressed by the word *advocate*. It was also by the Spirit that they were enabled to stand before kings and magistrates and boldly to speak in the name of Jesus.”

This great subject is inexhaustible, and here we are obliged to stop. The distinct propositions presented above, upon the work of the Holy Spirit, might be elaborated to considerable length with much profit, but this must be done on another occasion, and it would be a pleasing task, especially with reference to the witness of the Spirit in the heart of believers.

Sacred Scenes in Egypt and the Holy Land. By Rev. FERGUS FERGUSON, M.A. Glasgow: Thomas D. Morison, 8 Bath street.

Some one has placed this very pleasing volume on our table, and we take pleasure in commending it as one of the most truly devotional and intelligent collections of “Notes of Travel” which we have seen. It is the production of one of those excellent men connected with the Evangelical Union Church of Scotland, and exhibits both literary culture and earnest piety.

